ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED002156	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). N.A.	3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The Academically Talented - Fifth Tennessee Conference Sponsored by the Nemours Foundation and the Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc., and Coordinated by the Junior League

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): Luciot, Leonard J. and Owensby, Nona E.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Tennessee Preparatory School
ST. Nashville, Tennessee
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Tennessee Preparatory School
Nashville, Tennessee

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	3/62	92

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Conference Speeches

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

	talent development	academic programs
academically talented	developmental programs	community cooperation
academically gifted	curriculum planning	school administration
gifted children	student testing	creativity

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The goals of the conference were to arouse the interest of communities in Tennessee and the Mid-South in the academically talented; to inform both professional and lay people about current theory and practices in this area of education; to suggest specific pilot projects for lay groups subject to the approval of their boards of education; and to encourage long-range programs for developing the academic potential of talented children.

Fifteen major speeches were presented and were categorized as follows: Keynote -- "Education for Excellence," by Edward McCrady, and "The Challenge of Excellence," by Alfred I. Davies; Characteristics and Identification--"Nature and Needs of the Gifted," by Willard Abraham, "Creativity," by Laurence DeRidder, and "Identification and Testing," by Ernest McDaniel; Education Aspects--"Motivation and Guidance," by John D. Green, "Teaching the Gifted," by Walter Barbe, and "Curriculum for the Gifted," by Virgil S. Ward; Programs-- "A National Look at Programs for the Academically Talented," by J Ned Bryan, "Some Programs for the Academically Talented in Tennessee," by Vernon Johnson, and "The Superintendent and the Community in Programs for the Academically Talented," by E. C. Stimbert; Problems -- "Special Problems of Parents of the Gifted, by Willard Abraham, "What the Community Can Do to Help," by Walter Barbe, "Problems in Initiating and Continuing Programs for the Gifted," by Leonard J. Lucito; and Impressions--"Impressions of the Conference," by James G. Hughes.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

Miscellaneous

U. S. Office of Education
Talent Development Project

TD

ED002156

The Academically Talented

Fifth Tennessee Conference sponsored by the Nemours Foundation and the Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.

MARCH 22, 23 and 24, 1962
Memphis, Tennessee

Edited by Leonard J. Lucito and Nona E. Owensby

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"No nation which does not value trained intelligence can hope to survive"—ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD

Conference Goals

1. To arouse the interest of communities in Tennessee and the Mid-South for the academically talented.

2. To inform both professional and lay people about current theory and practices in this area of education.

3. To suggest specific pilot projects for lay groups with the approval of their Boards of Education.

4. To encourage long range programs for developing the academic potential of talented children.

The Nemours Foundation of Wilmington, Delaware is a charitable organization whose purpose is to aid handicapped children in the South. This aid is given through direct grants and through the financing of conferences.

Printed by Tennessee Preparatory School—Nashville

THE ACADEMICALLY TALENTED

Fifth Tennessee Conference sponsored by
the Nemours Foundation and the Tennessee
Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.,
and coordinated by the Junior League.

MARCH 22, 23 AND 24, 1962

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

Edited by

Leonard J. Lucito
Nona E. Owensby

CONTENTS

Page
PREFACE iv
CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE vi
JUNIOR LEAGUE COORDINATING COMMITTEE vii
COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS vii
PROGRAM viii

SPEECHES

Keynote

Education for Excellence 1
Edward McCrady, Ph.D., Vice-Chancellor and President, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee

The Challenge of Excellence 7
Alfred I. Davies, Vice-President, Sears, Roebuck and Company, Chicago, Illinois

Characteristics and Identification

Nature and Needs of the Gifted 15
Willard Abraham, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

Creativity 22
Laurence DeRidder, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee

Identification and Testing 33
Ernest McDaniel, Ph.D., Director, University Testing Service, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

Educational Aspects

Motivation and Guidance 37
John D. Greene, Ph.D., Director of Instruction, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana

Teaching the Gifted 41
Walter Barbe, Ph.D., Professor of Special Education, Department Head, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Curriculum for the Gifted 43
Virgil S. Ward, Ph.D., Associate Professor, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

CONTENTS

Programs

Page

A National Look at Programs for the Academically Talented....47
J Ned Bryan, Ph.D., Specialist, Gifted and Talented,
United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Some Programs for the Academically Talented in Tennessee....53
Vernon Johnson, Director, Area of Special Education,
Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

The Superintendent and the Community in Programs for the Academically Talented 56
E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent, Memphis City Schools,
Memphis, Tennessee

Problems

Special Problems of Parents of the Gifted 59
Willard Abraham, Ph.D., Professor of Education,
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

What Community Groups Can Do to Help 64
Walter Barbe, Ph.D., Professor of Special Education,
Department Head, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Problems in Initiating and Continuing Programs for the Gifted..71
Leonard J. Lucito, Ed.D., Associate Professor of
Special Education, Co-ordinator of Graduate Program
for the Gifted, George Peabody College for Teachers,
Nashville, Tennessee

Impressions

Impressions of the Conference 77

James G. Hughes, M.D., Treasurer,
Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children,
Memphis, Tennessee

PREFACE

In an effort to improve the education of the academically talented in Tennessee and the surrounding states, the Planning Committee of the Fifth Nemours' Tennessee Conference brought together a large number of outstanding professional personnel and interested lay people to exchange ideas, delineate issues, and discuss possible plans of action. Attendance was excellent—the group was larger than was originally anticipated; people with a wide variety of backgrounds and responsibilities for providing educational programs for the gifted were represented. Anyone walking the halls of the hotel or present at the workshop sessions was bound to be impressed by the quantity of enthusiastic, enlightened discussions and the amount of communication between individuals of such diverse interests and backgrounds. Undoubtedly, all who attend would agree that a running start was made toward accomplishing the goals of the conference.

This publication is an attempt to further these goals. All fifteen of the major speeches given at the conference have been condensed and are presented here. At the conference they served primarily two functions. First, basic information about the gifted was communicated to people who were not particularly familiar with this body of knowledge. Subsequently, they were better able to participate in the discussions. Second, both general session and workshop addresses were used to focus and stimulate discussion during the conference. The speeches were recorded on tape and transferred to typescript. Each speaker revised his own typescript with the purpose of preserving the important ideas and reducing the verbage. The editors then reworked the entire set of speeches to reduce duplications as much as possible and to present them in a sequence meaningful for a written report. It is hoped that the publication of the speeches in their final form will provide a record of the important ideas presented at the conference for those who attended. It is further hoped that some of the benefits of the conference might be extended to a larger audience through this publication.

As do all manuscripts with multiple contributors, this one suffers somewhat from a lack of continuity, due to orientation differences between speakers. This can be illustrated by the variety of terminology used by a number of them. Different terms such as academically talented, gifted, and intellectually superior have been used in referring to the group of students under consideration during the meeting. At times, these terms were being used synonymously. At other times, however, the lecturers were referring to different groups. Some were talking about pupils with high scores on a standardized IQ test, while others were speaking about those with high scores on a creativity test. Research suggests that these two approaches do not yield the same population of students. At still other times, participants were purposefully commenting on only one subgroup within the larger population of gifted pupils. Nevertheless, the diversity of viewpoints served the useful purposes of stimulating discussion and offering alternative conceptions of the gifted field.

In spite of the difficulty of continuity, some general conclusions seem to have been acceptable to most of the contributors. They agreed that earlier identification of the academically talented is important, that special education provisions for these children is worthwhile, and that community people do have a role to play. Pervading the whole body of speeches is the faith that any community willing to work toward the development of educational programs for the gifted can accomplish much.

There was a prodigious amount of work in developing the conference. The names of many who played important roles can be found in the listings of the Conference Steering Committee and the Junior League Coordinating Committee. Others are represented by the list of Cooperating Organizations. Many others, too numerous to mention, have also made important contributions by giving their time and skills. There are certain individuals and organizations, however, who should be given special recognition. The conference and this publication would not have been feasible without the generous financial support from Mrs. Alfred I. duPont and Dr. A. R. Shands, the Director of the Alfred I. duPont Institute of the Nemours Foundation. Just as important, these two people in conjunction with Dr. Merritt Shobe, President of the Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc., were flexible enough to go beyond the handicap notion so that a conference on the gifted became a reality. In addition, Dr. Shobe offered significant guidance throughout the planning and execution stages of the conference. The bulk of the tasks, however, were shouldered by the ladies of the Junior League. Two of these ladies made extraordinary efforts. Mrs. Newton Allen was the driving force for all that was done. Mrs. Frank Gilliland coordinated the typing and other details for this publication. Appreciation is also expressed to the speakers for their willingness to find time in busy schedules to prepare the talks for publication.

Leonard J. Lucito

Nona E. Owensby

Editors

CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE

HONORARY CHAIRMEN:

Cecil C. Humphreys, Ph.D., President, Memphis State University
Peyton N. Rhodes, Ph.D., President, Southwestern at Memphis

Mrs. Newton P. Allen, Chairman, Junior League Coordinating Committee
George Barnes, Superintendent, Shelby County Schools
Mrs. Lawrence Coe, Memphis Board of Education
Walter R. Coppedge, Headmaster, Lausanne School for Girls; Independent Schools Association
Shelby Counce, Director of Secondary Education, Memphis City Schools
Mrs. Poston Cox, President, Memphis Council of Parent-Teacher Associations
Mrs. Charles M. Crump, Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
Granville Davis, Ph.D., Director of Adult Education, Southwestern at Memphis
Mrs. Jed Dreifus, National Council of Jewish Women, Memphis Section
The Reverend John A. Elliott, Superintendent, Catholic Schools, Diocese of Nashville
Mrs. E. William Henry, Junior League
James G. Hughes, M.D., Treasurer, Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
Vernon Johnson, Director of Area of Special Education, Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville
Robert G. Jordan, M.D., Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
R. E. King, Principal, Central High School
Edward B. LeMaster, President, Memphis Chamber of Commerce
Leonard J. Lucito, Ed.D., Associate Professor of Special Education, Coordinator of Graduate Program for the Gifted, George Peabody College for Teachers; Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
Quinnie McCormick, Director of Child Adjustment, Memphis City Schools
Leonard Magnifico, Ph.D., Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Tennessee; Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
Mrs. George E. Morrow, Junior League
Arthur Rauscher, Director of Instruction, Shelby County Schools
John W. Richardson, Ed.D., Director of Graduate School, Memphis State University
Merritt Shobe, M.D., President, Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.
E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent, Memphis City Schools
Mrs. Hall Tacket, American Association of University Women, Memphis Branch
Mrs. Earle Wrenn, Better Schools Committee

JUNIOR LEAGUE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mrs. Newton P. Allen, Chairman
Mrs. E. William Henry, Co-Chairman
Mrs. George E. Morrow, Co-Chairman
Mrs. John Clark Porter, Art
Mrs. William T. Eubanks, Decorations
Mrs. William P. Kenworthy, Finance
Mrs. Joel J. Hobson, Jr., Hospitality
Mrs. Ross Clark, II, Hotel Reservations
Mrs. Ross M. Lynn, Independent Schools
Mrs. William R. Bruce, Mailing
Mrs. William H. Morse, Meals
Mrs. Frank Gilliland, Jr., Chairman, Proceedings
Mrs. Pope McCorkle, Co-Chairman, Proceedings
Mrs. John Walt, Co-Chairman, Proceedings
Mrs. James Wetter, Promotion
Mrs. R. Beverly Ray, Chairman, Newspaper Publicity
Mrs. George Clarke, Co-Chairman, Newspaper Publicity
Mrs. J. Pervis Milnor, Jr., Radio and Television Publicity
Mrs. Edward W. Cook, Chairman, Public Relations
Mrs. Frank A. Jones, Jr., Co-Chairman, Public Relations
Mrs. Steve Turnbull, Registration
Mrs. William Phillips, Jr., Secretarial Work
Mrs. Arthur Fulmer, Jr., Sessions Rooms
Mrs. E. William Henry, Chairman, Speakers Bureau
Mrs. Sidney Genette, Jr., Co-Chairman, Speakers Bureau
Mrs. Hamilton Smythe, III, Co-Chairman, Speakers Bureau
Mrs. Robert Clayton Rogers, Transportation

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of University Women, Memphis Branch
Better Schools Committee
Memphis Association of Independent Schools
Memphis Board of Education
Memphis Catholic Schools
Memphis Council of Parent-Teacher Associations
Memphis State University
National Council of Jewish Women, Memphis Section
Shelby County Board of Education
Southwestern at Memphis
University of Tennessee, Medical Units

PROGRAM

Thursday, March 22, 1962—OPENING SESSION
Music Hall, Ellis Auditorium

8:00 P.M. PRESIDING: PEYTON N. RHODES, Ph.D., President, Southwestern at Memphis

INVOCATION: THE REVEREND HENRY E. RUSSELL, D.D., Minister, Second Presbyterian Church

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: ALFRED I. DAVIES, Vice-President, Sears, Roebuck and Company, Chicago
"The Challenge of Excellence"

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: EDWARD McCRADY, Ph.D., Vice-Chancellor and President, University of the South, Sewanee
"Education for Excellence"

Friday, March 23, 1962—MORNING SESSION
Chisca-Plaza Ballroom

8:30 A.M. REGISTRATION Lobby (no registration fee)

9:30 A.M. PRESIDING: WILLIAM D. GALBREATH, President, Memphis Board of Education

INVOCATION: THE REVEREND JAMES A. WAX, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel

WELCOME: THE HONORABLE HENRY LOEB, Mayor, City of Memphis

GREETINGS: W. H. GOODMAN, Chairman, Board of Managers, Nemours Foundation, Jacksonville, Florida

SPEAKER: WILLARD ABRAHAM, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona
"Nature and Needs of the Gifted"

SPEAKER: WALTER BARBE, Ph.D., Professor of Special Education, Department Head, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
"Teaching the Gifted"

12:00 NOON RECESS

PROGRAM

Friday, March 23, 1962—AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P.M.-3:30 P.M. SERIES OF WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP 1 **"Identification and Testing"**

MODERATOR: SHELBY COUNCE, Director of Secondary Education, Memphis City Schools

SPEAKER: ERNEST McDANIEL, Ph.D., Director of University Testing Service, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

QUESTIONERS:
- WILLIAM GILMER, Psychologist
- ROSS M. LYNN, LL.D., Headmaster, Memphis University School
- JAMES McCANN, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Memphis State University
- MYRTLE NASH, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology, Southwestern at Memphis
- W. J. VON LACKUM, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, University of Tennessee Medical School

WORKSHOP 2 **"Motivation and Guidance"**

MODERATOR: THE REVEREND JOHN A. ELLIOTT, Superintendent, Catholic Schools, Diocese of Nashville

SPEAKER: JOHN D. GREENE, Ph.D., Director of Instruction, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana

QUESTIONERS:
- A. F. HAYNES, Ed.D., Associate Professor of Education, Memphis State University
- MISS RUTH KNOWLTON, Supervisor of Modern Foreign Languages, State Department of Education
- ALLEN R. LEVIN, Psychologist, Jewish Service Agency
- W. R. McNEILL, Superintendent, Bowling Green Public Schools, Bowling Green, Kentucky
- PERRY D. SCRIVNER, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Southwestern at Memphis

PROGRAM

WORKSHOP 3 "Special Problems of Parents of the Gifted"

MODERATOR: GEORGE BARNES, Superintendent, Shelby County Schools

SPEAKER: WILLARD ABRAHAM, Ph.D., Professor of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

QUESTIONERS: MRS. GRACE AARONS, Family Service of Memphis

JAMES G. HUGHES, M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, University of Tennessee Medical School

LAWRENCE C. LOBAUGH, Headmaster, St. Mary's Episcopal School

GEORGE W. MARTEN, M.D., Director of Mental Health Center

MRS. E. E. REISMAN, JR., President, Tennessee Citizens Committee for Better Schools, Chattanooga

WORKSHOP 4 "What Community Groups Can Do to Help"

MODERATOR: GRANVILLE DAVIS, Ph.D., Director of Adult Education, Southwestern at Memphis

SPEAKER: WALTER BARBE, Ph.D., Professor of Special Education, Department Head, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

QUESTIONERS: GRANVILLE ALLISON, Reporter, The Commercial Appeal

MISS MARY LOUISE CALDWELL, Director of Religious Education, Trinity Methodist Church

MRS. L. M. GRAVES, Past President, Tennessee Congress of Parents and Teachers

PAUL SCHWARTZ, Director of Jewish Community Center

JOHN SPENCE, Reporter, Memphis Press-Scimitar

PROGRAM

WORKSHOP 5 "Creativity"

MODERATOR: WALTER R. COPPEDGE, Headmaster, Lausanne School for Girls

SPEAKER: LAURENCE DeRIDDER, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

QUESTIONERS:

MRS. THOMAS B. DUTCHER, Kindergarten Teacher, Lausanne School for Girls

MISS BETTY FOLEY, Medical Social Worker, Child Development Clinic, LeBonheur Children's Hospital

MISS ELIZABETH HAMLIN, Director of Elementary Education, Memphis City Schools

ROBERT MORROW, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

HENRY ZURHELLEN, Teacher, Graves Road School, Shelby County Schools

WORKSHOP 6 "Problems in Initiating and Continuing Programs for the Gifted"

MODERATOR: JOHN W. RICHARDSON, Ed.D., Director of Graduate School, Memphis State University

SPEAKER: LEONARD J. LUCITO, Ed.D., Associate Professor of Special Education, Co-ordinator of Graduate Program for the Gifted, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville

QUESTIONERS:

GEORGE CHISM, Supervisor of Special Education, Shelby County Schools

SAM JOHNSON, Ed.D., Director of School of Education, Memphis State University

FRED D. PULTZ, Ph.D., Director of Presbyterian Guidance Center, Southwestern at Memphis

WALTER RUBY, Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology, University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga

PROGRAM

Friday, March 23, 1962—EVENING SESSION

8:00 P.M. PRESIDING: Cecil C. Humphreys, Ph.D., President, Memphis State University

SPEAKER: VIRGIL S. WARD, Ph.D., Associate Professor, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

"Curriculum for the Gifted"

Saturday, March 24, 1962—MORNING SESSION

9:30 A.M. PRESIDING: Walter P. Armstrong, Jr., Past President, Board of Education

INVOCATION: THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR J. HAROLD SHEA, Sacred Heart Church, Dean of West Tennessee

SPEAKER: J NED BRYAN, Ph.D., Specialist, Gifted and Talented, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

"A National Look at Programs for the Academically Talented"

SPEAKER: VERNON JOHNSON, Director, Area of Special Education, Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville

"Some Programs for the Academically Talented in Tennessee"

SPEAKER: E. C. STIMBERT, Superintendent, Memphis City Schools

"The Superintendent and the Community
in Programs for the Academically Talented"

SPEAKER: JAMES G. HUGHES, M.D., Treasurer, Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.

"Summary of Conference"

12:00 NOON ADJOURNMENT
12:15 P.M. LUNCHEON MEETING, Board of Directors, Tennessee Council for Handicapped Children, Inc.

In-Service Teacher Training
Saturday, March 24, 1962, 9:00 A.M.-1:00 P.M.
Telecast by WKNO—Channel 10
to local teachers in their schools

KEYNOTE

EDUCATION FOR EXCELLENCE

by
Edward McCrady

I propose to talk about education for excellence, but I think I ought to start off with some comment on democracy in this connection. It seems there has been a lot of confusion about that. I am a democrat deeply at heart. I am not talking politically now. I mean I believe in democracy in the sense that I believe in equality of opportunity. I don't mean I believe we have it. I mean I believe we *ought* to have it. When people misconceive democracy to mean the assumption that everybody is like everybody else, it is just obvious nonsense. People are not alike. Nobody has to be told that. They are different in height, in weight, in quickness, in health, in intelligence, in morality, and in every conceivable way. In fact that is the most characteristic aspect about living things, that each is unique. Now we ought to be honest about differences; they're just a part of the world that we live in. Democracy should not shut its eyes to truth. It ought to face the fact of differences of capacities at the same time that it espouses equality of opportunity.

The next thing that I want to comment on is something about the source of differences. It's an ancient, hoary argument between the advocates of nature and of nurture. You know that many people want to attribute all these differences to genes and that many people want to attribute all these differences to the circumstances under which one happens to be raised. It is hard to get a sane evaluation of the relative roles of heredity and environment. Certain political dogmas have been very authoritarian in this connection. The communist, that is to say the Marxian, conception of a perfect state, or the Marxian world-salvation doctrine, assumes that all differences are due to environment. This is a great over simplification, of course. They literally wiped out the whole genetic fraternity in Russia. They abolished the whole Institute of Genetics of Moscow. They liquidated all the geneticists, because the geneticists didn't happen to be finding things that were reconcilable with their own doctrine of how to save the world. If what the geneticists were finding was true, then the problems of the world were not as simple as Marx had claimed. It was in 1939 that all the geneticists were exterminated. I'll never forget it because I was planning to go to a Congress of Genetics in Moscow that year, and it suddenly was cancelled.

Both environment and heredity are equally involved and equally essential in the complete account of any feature of an individual. The genes do determine what the possibilities are, and the environment largely determines which of these possibilities you in fact realize.

An illustration may be taken from a study of apes, who are sometimes embarrassingly like us. My friend Dr. Yerkes of Yale spent his life studying chimpanzees. He had a large colony of them down in Florida and gave some of them extraordinary privileges.

He took a newborn human baby and a newborn chimp baby and raised them under identical circumstances with no difference of privilege. He showered affection on both, gave each all the benefit of his learning, and tried to train them with complete equality of opportunity. For the first six months or so the chimp did better than the human. But once the baby began to talk the ape was hopelessly left behind. There was nothing he could do about it—he never caught up. Opportunity meant nothing to him. He just had the wrong ancestors. That's all there was to it, and no amount of opportunity could compensate.

The child might not have learned how to talk without the proper opportunities. If the child had just been raised among chimps, it would only have made the gurgles and squeaks which are characteristics of chimps. To learn to speak English he'd have to have the proper opportunity, but he couldn't have done it without the right ancestors either. He had to have the genes. It was only the genes and the circumstances which could bring about the result. This is true with all of the features that I am going to discuss.

Differences are all the result of both inheritance and environment, and I want to comment somewhat on the nature of the differences. I mentioned that people differ in every possible feature. Let's just consider the academic or intellectual differences for a moment. The range there is as impressive as the range in height or weight. I think I can make this most clear by giving a few illustrations of some remarkable cases. We generally grade them on an I.Q. scale of which 190 is about the highest level, 100 is average, and 140, we'll say, is Ph.D. level. I'll comment more on other such levels in a moment, but a mind of the 180 or 190 sort is a rare and impressive thing. It can perform functions which are perfectly incredible to other people.

What I want to point out is that a few dozen or a few hundred or at most a very small fraction of one percent of mankind have determined practically all of human history. You simply wouldn't have had modern medicine without Pasteur or his equivalent. You could spell it with some other name, but you'd have to have a 180 I.Q. mind to do it at all. You wouldn't have had the atomic era without Einstein or the industrial era without Newton. Newton laid down the laws out of which all of the industrial applications have come. The absence of a Shakespeare or Handel in history would have been a terrible injury to your life and mine. It would have made them infinitely less rich than they are. I just want to emphasize again, you must have a few minds of that level in order for history to move along. No multiplication of lower levels will take their place, and you've got to find them and give them the right environment in which to work. You remember in "Gray's Elegy" the lines:

So many a rose is born to
 blush unseen
And waste is fragrance on the
 desert air.

There are many geniuses who are raised in situations where they have wasted their lives. This is very unfortunate for mankind and for history. We must find these able ones and give them the opportunities to make the contributions which only *they* can make.

I want to spend a few minutes talking about the European educational systems, which may have gone too far in that direction. At any rate, they've concentrated on just the bright. They took the lead from Plato. In *The Republic* he gives a very elaborate system of weeding out. The educational process for Plato was a process of getting rid of those who couldn't qualify, and sorting and sorting for fifty years, by the way. He didn't think you were ready to be entrusted with the responsibility of the government until you were fifty years old. By that time you were the end product of quite a series of weeding out stages.

The European systems have developed in a parallel way. The universities were the oldest part of the systems. I've spent a good deal of time studying educational systems in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and Russia. What I'm saying now would be true of all of them. The universities existed before there were any other kinds of schools. Only the wealthy and privileged could go there, and they trained for the learned professions (theology, law, medicine) and government. Later when science became a valid intellectual discipline, it was included. To prepare for the university in those days, you studied under a tutor. Only the wealthy could go there, and the wealthy had tutors in their homes. So you were privately prepared to take the entrance exams which the universities prescribed and administered. The rest of the population had no education at all. There were prepared for jobs by apprenticeships.

The next step was that tutors banded together to offer their services to anybody who would pay their price rather than confining their attentions to one household. They called these public schools. Not that there was any tax support; it had nothing to do with the government. They were public because they were not confined to one private household. They were what we would call private college preparatory schools. I'm talking about Eton and Harrow, and you can go on with the list. They were like our college preparatory schools except for one thing. They didn't give any examinations, diplomas, or degrees; they gave no indication whatever of accomplishment. Their sole purpose was to prepare the student to take the college entrance exam which was prescribed and administered by the college. The universities, in other words, controlled the whole system. The public schools prepared one to get into the university, and the success of the public school was gauged by one's success in taking the exam which came from the other end. The public schools didn't give any exam at all. This is still going on.

In the nineteenth century, in connection with democratization in general, there was an effort to extend general education to all who were going to vote, which means teaching the three R's, as they used to be called. So the county-council systems were developed which provide public education through the elementary grades. But still at the age of eleven, they're all sorted out by examination and only the top fifteen or twenty percent go on to what corresponds to the second stage which I mentioned—the public school which means the college preparatory stage. Then there's a big weeding out at the end of that. So that the percentage that gets into the university is a very small percent, but a very highly qualified group. In England they are given the extremely personal attention of private individual tutorial sessions every week. This is not true on the continent. On the continent they don't give a hoot what their student does between the time he pays his fees and the time he takes his exam. At the Sorbonne if you pass your exams you get a degree, but you can do anything you wish in the meanwhile as far as the faculty's concerned. They don't make any effort to see that you qualify—that's up to you. But in either case, what finally comes out is a highly selected, polished, and refined product.

Let me spend one minute or two on what a college preparatory curriculum is in any of these countries I was talking about. It is a six year course—they call them six forms in England or France. They correspond to the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades in our system. You will already have had some Latin and French, but it doesn't matter. In any case, you will take both of these in the seventh grade, and you will continue to take French for six years. I mean everybody—and I mean every day. Not only every day—you'll take them six hours a week and there aren't but five days in the weekly schedule, so one day you'll take them two hours. You'll have French six hours a week for six years if you are going into any university at all. You won't begin your Greek until the ninth grade. You'll start German in the tenth. Of course, you take English all the way through everyday for six years. You take math all the way through for six years, and this goes through differential calculus. You will have general science in the first and second years. Then you'll take physics and chemistry and biology and geography. I mean all of them, not just a grab bag out of that. Your chemistry will go through organic and a little quantitative analysis. In the social sciences, you'll have about four years of history. In the senior year, you'll have economics. In arts and crafts you'll take music for six years, but not six hours a week. And some years it is only one hour a week. In the music however, you'll go into basic theory, harmony and counterpoint; you won't just sing together. You'll learn some academic facts about music which will also sharpen your appreciation. And you'll learn something about the history of music and composers. You'll also have painting and sculpture and handicrafts. Again, not many hours a week, but six years' worth. Everybody will take them. And you'll take religion for six years. The only exception is when a parent sends in a written request. A student may be excused from the course which is required to be given, but if he's excused, he'll have to go to study hall; he won't be allowed to twiddle his thumbs. He'll have supervised study during the period while the others are studying religion. This is a forty hour week, incidentally, you'll note by adding up some of this. This is a deadly serious business. They work at academic subjects forty hours a week. I'll make this reservation, there are three hours a week of physical education, one of which is calisthenics, and two of which are games. That's three out of those forty which are not strictly academic. This goes on for six years.

Now compared with what goes on in America, I think this is rather startling. You know, we act as if, and often say, Americans are no good at languages. We haven't the slightest idea whether we are or not. We haven't ever tried them. We haven't made any effort. You just expose any average baby to any language on earth, and he will learn without even trying in a very few years. If you make the student study French, German, or anything else for six years, six hours a week, he'll learn it in Memphis as well as he will in London. The truth is, we haven't tried. I would say, though, the use of languages instead of decreasing is increasing. With communications around the world, with trade around the world, and with international complications around the world, it is totally unrealistic if we don't learn to communicate with those outside our geographical boundaries. The only way you can possibly get a realistic education for the modern world is to start languages a lot earlier than we've been doing it in America. Get all grammar behind you in the grammar school—that's the place to study grammar, and don't start any of it in college. If you do it's too late to get an education. You'll never learn as much science, social sciences, philosophy, and history as you ought to if you wait until you get to college to start these basic things. These means of communication are the whole device of transmitting the cumulative experience of mankind. Language is the mechanism by which you educate, and you've certainly got to get it first.

I want to say just a little bit in winding up this discussion. We have a lot to learn from Europe, and they have a lot to learn from us as well. I would like to have given a separate lecture on that subject because that's very fresh in my mind, since I've just been studying it. We need to improve our elementary and high schools tremendously. They need to extend general education to a later period of life when there is more maturity. They stop general education at the age of seventeen; we take it to the age of twenty in a liberal arts college. I'm not talking about a technical school where we might start specializing early. If we have a shorter pre-college curriculum and then start specializing at the college level, we'll be hopelessly behind our counterparts in Europe. Remember that a larger proportion of Americans go to college than anyone else; a larger proportion go on beyond college to graduate school than anyone else. If we extend our general education to a later period of life and then go on to post-graduate studies, we may wind up with more breadth *and* depth than our counterparts in Europe, and a larger proportion of us do. So I'm not just being strictly critical of America. But think of what we could do if we did as well as the elementary stages as they're doing, and there's not the slightest reason why we shouldn't. If we did that plus the *best* of our present college and post-graduate programs we'd have a chance of really leading the world.

Now there's one other thing I want to say about that. More people are going to college now than ever before. In other words, the environment is being prepared for a large proportion of those who have the good fortune to have a favorable genetic cluster; there is unmistakably selective mating. I mean that the young English Ph.D. candidate doesn't generally marry the pretty nurse. He marries the English lit. major who knows what he's talking about. This isn't just a sentimental hunch of mine. A study of the women who major in physics, for instance, discloses that more than fifty percent of them marry physicists. There is a great tendency for people to marry somebody who doesn't differ more than 10 points, we'll say, on the I.Q. scale. This is almost universal. Now this is very significant genetically. If in a population with an average of 100, only one in 300 has an I.Q. of 140, consider a more restricted population. The population of Oak Ridge is made up of an extraordinary proportion of Ph.D's, and the sons and daughters grow up together and marry each other. Among the children of that kind of marriage you have a scatter along the average of the parents, not along the average of the population. Well now, if in a population averaging 100, one out of 300 has an I.Q. of 140, in a population averaging 140 would one out of 300 have an I.Q. of 180? That's a very interesting question. There's a good deal of genetic evidence that this is the case. The concentration and increasing numbers of university faculties, their tendency to intermarriage, as well as these great centers where people of high I.Q. get collected together may be producing concentrations of genes which could make it unnecessary to wait another five hundred years for another 190. In fact we might have a cluster of them in your day and mine. This is something to think about. It is frightening, in a way, but think of the symphonies that might be composed. In any case, I am perfectly sure that the old idea that history is a race between education and catastrophe is much more realistic today than it ever was before. If we're interested in surviving in this race and escaping the catastrophic possibility, we must do everything we can to find this select group and provide the proper opportunity for them.

I might say as a final comment on that, don't ever underestimate the importance of your parents. No matter how you evaluate the relative effect of genes and of environment, your parents can't be unimportant because they provide both.

Now, this is just the last thought. We may be facing such a renaissance as never has happened before in history. We may live to see a population of geniuses such as history has never before seen, and get glimpses into the cosmos which no other people have been privileged to have. I pray to God that we'll be worthy of the revelation. Thank you.

THE CHALLENGE OF EXCELLENCE

by

Alfred I. Davies

The challenge of excellence is with us everywhere. Ours is the job of meeting that challenge. Excellence means many different things to many people.

It is a nebulous, hard to define term, relative at best, and often overworked as an adjective and underworked as an attainment. I like to think of excellence as the ability to beat standards and to beat them by as wide a margin as possible.

All of you have heard comments about the need for excellence in the years ahead. Such expressions are: the challenge of the space age; the need for better understanding of our economy; the need for improved business leadership; the need for broader gauged statesmen; the need for improved professionalism among our educators; and many more. I would like to discuss some of these points and others too from the view of a businessman.

In my opinion, business and professional men and women, parents, and teachers, have not teamed as well as they should for the betterment of Junior's education with the ultimate betterment of our whole American way of life.

The business community with its vast facilities for injecting more of the practicalities into education is being little used at the teacher and student level. Thus we are missing opportunities to help students bridge the gap between high school and college graduation and the entrance into the business world. I am saying that, for the student to have optimum understanding of the economic world in which he is living, he should be permitted to visit business and industry as often as practical through all levels of his education. By the same token, the businessman-industrialist should be fitted into classroom activities as often as is feasible. Teachers, especially those instructing in business and economics, must have firsthand knowledge of the buiness world if they are to be properly armed for daily teaching tasks. A teacher who does not keep abreast of theory and practice in his field is destined to failure, as is a businessman who ignores his competition and consumer demands. Students must learn they are living in a most competitive world. Teachers and businessmen can best get this point over by precept and example. Young and old alike in most walks of life today have an intolerable ignorance of business and industry and the far reaching economics of our everyday world. Only about one or two out of every ten high school students today are taking, or will they ever take, a separate course in economics. These are tomorrow's teachers, businessmen, parents, and voters. This lack, to a large degree, can be blamed for the high incidence of business failures each year, for indecisiveness at the voting polls, for unsound so-called "public decisions," and for the many problems our youngsters and oldsters alike have in handling their personal business and finances. One of our greatest causes of divorce is the financial strain young married people experience because of lack of ability to live within budgets they are not equipped to make or understand.

Public opinion polls utilizing a fair sample of high school seniors and teachers from areas throughout the country have indicated an alarming lack of understanding of our free enterprise system and American economic principles. When asked the size of profits after taxes made on sales by business in general, the seniors guessed 25% —the teachers guessed 13%. When asked what they considered a "fair profit," the seniors' answers averaged 20%: the teachers' 10%. Of course, the average profit of the country's leading corporations is only 5% to 6% of sales with many of them falling into the 2% and 3% category and lower.

The seniors thought that on the average in a manufacturing company each profit dollar divided between workers and owners is split 50-50. The teachers thought 60% went to the workers, and 40% to the company. Actually, an average of 87% goes to the employees, and 13% to owners. Fringe benefits often given an additional advantage to employees in profit division.

When asked what is the surest way to raise the country's living standard, 18% of the seniors replied, "increase wages;" 38% said, "lower prices;" 18% said, "limit profits;" 5% said, "increase government spending;" and only 21% were able to rationalize the correct answer; "produce more goods per man hour."

These are only examples of the shocking fact that our young people and some of their teachers simply do not know the economic facts of a life they must live no matter what direction their future leads them.

We can correct much of what we lack in this area by giving practical economics a necessarily important role in high school curricula. In Memphis, as is true throughout this area, all of the necessary ingredients for equipping our high school and college trained students with ample economics are available. Excellent cooperation and coordination exists among the various school systems, the Chamber of Commerce, the Sales Executives Club, Better Business Bureau, Educational Television, Junior Achievement, and other organizations.

Junior Achievement offers a most practical method of teaching private enterprise. Young people have an unusual opportunity to get into business for themselves and to discover through personal experience the principles and values of our American business system.

They learn what it takes to run a successful business, to meet a payroll, to design and produce a quality product, and to satisfy the customer. They develop the ability to meet and solve problems, to make decisions, to work together as a team, to make profits, and, yes, sometimes wind up with a loss. Unfortunately, most Junior Achievement chapters can handle only a very small percentage of high school juniors and seniors who would like to be accepted.

In Memphis at present 450 young people ages 15 through 19 are participating in Junior Achievement by operating 34 companies and producing and marketing a wide variety of products and services. Since its start, 271 companies have been formed by about 4,250 "achievers." A total of 2,700 young people have been stockholders, over 90% of whom had never owned stock of any kind before. Junior Achievement company products have been sold to 37,600 Memphis customers. Gross sales of Junior Achievement companies nationally were more than two million dollars in 1960-61.

The Memphis Chamber of Commerce and The Commercial Appeal have given deserved recognition to scholastic excellence through their annual Academic Awards Program. This idea provides a big community-wide pat on the back for a job well done by high school graduates placing in the top 4% of their classes. The third recognition banquet will be held this year in June. These award dinners honoring students, parents, and teachers, are designed to bring the business community and academic talent more closely together.

The whole range of vocational education offers wide latitudes in helping train people for specific crafts. We have high hopes for every success in the field of distributive education, with which most of you are familiar. Our initial results have been most gratfying. Through this program we and many other firms involved in distribution hire students for work after school hours. Their retailing experience is backed up with on-the-job training and a certain amount of classroom study in this area. By the time they graduate from high school they should have had ample occasion to decide whether this is a career which appeals to them. Many, of course, have the ability and desire to go on to college. But in so doing they may choose to continue their part-time work to gain additional experience and to help themselves through college.

Another specific challenge we have in the field of excellence is to produce a larger percentage of intellectually talented from each graduating class. Again, this should come as a result of a closer working relationship among teachers, parents, and the business community. Our educational systems must turn out a board base of balanced intellect to furnish the necessary leadership for the dynamic growth of this country. I have seen, while sitting on scholarship award committees, students with average I.Q. ratings and moderate native intelligence who had excelled through determination and desire. We must devise ways to inculcate in more students this desire to excel.

One way to keep students and parents constantly in touch with the need for excellence is to present to them at regular intervals through school papers, P.T.A. meetings, student meetings, and other means of communication, pertinent information relative to getting an education. An example of this type of information is this list of facts:

College costs today and projected college costs for the years ahead	1970—$ 2,550
A college graduate earns in a lifetime	435,000
And a high school grad earns in a lifetime	257,000

The difference, which is a rough measure of the value of college	178,000

We should inform students of updated lists of best jobs to steer for: teachers, doctors, dentists, nurses, therapists, medical technologists, dieticians, social workers, chemists, physicists, social scientists, mathematicians, statisticians, actuaries, accountants, economists, engineers (chemical, electrical, mechanical), salespeople, repairmen, purchasing agents, traffic managers, psychologists, machine programmers.

We should keep students familiar with average starting salaries in major job classifications, as well as average annual earnings 5 to 10 years after being on different jobs.

Students and parents can be encouraged to make maximum efforts to finance a higher education by keeping them advised on the necessity for an education in this nation, the most educated in the world.

Relatively small percentages of our total school enrollees will turn out to be like Col. John Glenn. Nor will too many wind up corporation presidents. Yet, just as it took thousands of individuals to back up the efforts of Col. Glenn's orbital flight, it takes thousands of people to back up the successful efforts of businesses large and small. It is a challenge to the excellence of our educational institutions to see that those traveling through their portals leave equipped to best use their training, regardless of the intellectual quadrant in which they graduate. The laboring class of tomorrow is not going to be a pick-and-shovel class. They will be button pushers, switch throwers, key turners, and dial twisters, with greater need for mental flexibility and adaptability.

Automation will become increasingly important in our way of life. Thus we in the business of business, and you in the business of education, must plan and work toward properly training tomorrow's citizenry to become an integral part of an automated world. The United States is currently supporting a vast and complicated defense system which requires the use of sophisticated electrical devices. These devices may be the creation of an individual genius, but must be operated by someone of far less capabilities. Only through an adequate early education can we hope to find the soldiers or civilians we need to perform the task to which they are assigned.

Much has been spoken but little has been said about how automation will replace thousands of jobs. This is the same cry, of course, that civilization has been hearing since the invention of the wheelbarrow. Our electronic devices, data processing equipment, teaching machines, etc. are developed from knowledge and basic need. All of these new machines will have economic application, and economic application leads to industry. New industry requires new employment. But with all of this, many will be replaced by mechanization, necessitating effect and efficient retraining to utilize our labor forces properly.

I am convinced that neither educators nor businessmen have utilized our young people to the extent possible. If this is to continue to be the land of milk and honey, then we must give those that will be charged with this responsibility the wherewithal to keep it so. Why should not pupils be permitted to grade teachers at regular intervals? The likelihood is that a student's-eye-view would give teachers some food for thought and a self improvement guide that could make them much more effective. Younger employees, too, should be given the opportunity to offer constructive criticism about their bosses and the areas pertinent to their daily work routine. One of Sears' most successful programs is our Employees' Suggestion System, in which we constantly encourage our people to express their ideas as to how we can improve our merchandise, our procedures, and our services. Last year we had at least one suggestion from every employee in each of our eleven mail order plants, and 100% participation in 723 of our other company units—almost 100 thousand suggestions in all. Not only do we receive thousands of profit making and profit saving ideas each year, but our employees' morale is usually highest where suggestions are most prevalent. Of course, the employee is usually most amply rewarded for good suggestions. People enjoy the sense of belonging they get from properly recognized suggestions.

A comment that cannot and must not be overlooked is the challenge we have in what a recent article in a national periodical called "one of America's most crippling and least known failures: we waste more than one million kids a year. As we once wasted natural gas and forests and top soil, today we waste our most valuable natural resource—the productive power of young brains and muscles, the creative power of young imaginations and emotions. We waste them because we neither keep them in school nor give them jobs." The article goes on to say that in 1960 about 2,500,000 youngsters reached age eighteen, the age when most are graduated from high school. About one third of these graduated and went on to college; another third quit their formal schooling after graduating, and the other third had dropped out of school before graduating. Studies have revealed that nearly 20% of the dropouts have an I.Q. of more than 120. Other studies have shown that about 50,000 of the dropouts in any one year were among the nation's potentially most able students. We have been intelligent enough to stop wasting natural gas—to conserve and replant our depleted forests, and to save our top soil from wind and water erosion. Saving and putting to best possible use our dropout students should be a much more rewarding accomplishment. This is a goal from which there must be no deterrent.

Among other things, it has never been too clear to me why we have not taught shorthand, typing, and speed reading in more grammar schools, with refresher or advanced courses in these subjects no later than junior year of high school. So many subjects require copious note taking, yet most of our schools have not thought it necessary to equip youngsters with the wherewithal to best accomplish this. Too, rapid note taking ability is a valuable tool in all levels of business or professional life. Typing, of course, can be of inestimable value to pupil, teacher, and postgraduates. Speed reading with ample retention of that read could provide much more studying in the same time or the same coverage in less time. If taught early enough, we would negate the necessity of correcting slow or wrong reading habits at a later date. I am aware that some or all of these subjects are being taught in most high schools, but I believe much good could be derived from having them taught at an earlier age. Then one other missing element in curricula is a course on "how to study." My observations are that most youngsters do not know how to study and consequently waste many hours in attempting to learn their assignments.

Contiguous to all schooling should be the teaching of pride of one's community, pride of one's state, and pride and love of country. Particularly should we teach our youngsters (and ourselves) not to criticize our communities if they are not willing to work toward correcting shortcomings. Those who are always knocking do not know how to ring the bell.

Learning can best flourish when teachers create a climate in which children are genuinely desirous of learning. Self motivation, knowing that learning is necessary and important, is the key to success in any year of high school, any year of college, and any level in the business world. Teachers, parents, and businessmen must be moving forces in stimulating this motive for excellence.

Most of man's adult effectiveness rests upon his ability to function well in groups, to get along well with others. Our children must come out of high school and college with acceptance of responsibility, critical thinking, self-discipline ability, respect for others, acceptance of rightful authority, and the understanding of processes of effective group action.

Among the most important lessons we must teach our students of excellence is respect for hard work and the fact that few worthwhile accomplishments come easy. Our way of life in this country is swiftly removing the natural obstacles to existence that made our fathers strong and resourceful. Americans, as a society, no longer have to struggle to survive. Even the chores that were once part of our around the house daily lives, such as lawn mowing, dishwashing, clothes washing and drying, are handled by machines. This places upon the teacher an increasing responsibility to offset the diminishing necessity for physical labor in our daily routine by the enhancement of intellectual labor. *For labor we must.* Further, it is clear that schools possess an opportunity to provide outlets for the manual and creative potential in students through providing programs and materials for realistic physical work with tools. This is compatible with the do-it-yourself trend in modern living.

Then there is another outstandingly important challenge of excellence that befalls the teacher-parent-businessman team. It is convincing our talented students that the teaching field needs them as badly as any field that could be named. To convince bright youngsters of any given truth can only be done if the weight of the evidence is correctly balanced. It therefore becomes immediately apparent that the job attractiveness must be unquestioned, and it is the duty of each of us to make it so. If our youngsters are our nation's most valuable resource, and no one can dispute this, then the most talented of the talented must be the teachers in each succeeding generation. All of us owe it to the teaching fraternity of tomorrow, but more importantly to those to be taught by tomorrow's teachers, a better than pro rata share of the academically talented. To do this, teacher recognition must be given every attention in all areas of community and business life.

In business language, we constantly need a market analysis to tell our schools in what area their product will best sell and under what conditions. This information must be frequently updated for guidance purposes in strengthening curricula and better directing students in the use of their capabilities in their chosen fields. We need to be able to anticipate with fair accuracy the number of engineers, scientists, mathematicians, agriculturists, programmers for our vast array of data processing machinery, teachers, and other major vocational needs the nation will require on a year to year basis. Thus, we can budget our manpower for whatever anticipated mission or goal we shall set for our country as a whole. This, of course, should be broken down by state and areas or combination of areas surrounding a given locale.

Always we must keep in mind that the specifications for an automobile can probably be written on two typewritten pages, whereas the specifications for a human being would require an estimated 2 million typewritten pages. We are dealing with the world's most complex product.

In manufacturing or in the rendering of a service one of the greatest problems is quality control. One bad tube or one faulty transistor can cause an otherwise excellent TV set to produce a bad picture. One faulty valve and one broken bolt did inactivate the John Glenn venture for a period of time. Quality control is even more important in producing high school and college graduates. We must produce balanced, capable products in our schools. It has been said that if you send an idiot to college, when he is through you have nothing but a college educated idiot. Then there is the popular notion that highbrows are those with lots of brains and no sense, and that lowbrows are people with lots of sense and no brains. Ours is the job of developing the best adult possible out of the raw material which enters our schools and emerges later to take his place in a complex world. He must be taught to merchandise himself by always presenting himself in the best possible light, playing up his strong points, working on his weaknesses, overcoming those where it is possible, and ignoring those about which he can do nothing.

Also students should be taught the art of analyzing and measuring other people. In gauging others one must learn to determine: what has he got that I haven't, and how can I use it as part of my makeup; what does he have that I don't want, and what safeguards should I set up to insure not getting it. One of the measures of leadership is the ability to surround oneself with capable people from which, by delegation of responsibility, maximum help can be attained. This is an art in itself.

School boards, Chambers of Commerce, and P.T.A. groups must be the catalysts in successfully formulizing teachers, business community, and parents into the kind of board of directors needed. The goal will be to show progressively better "corporate growth" and "product improvement" in this business of educating for excellence, with greater profits and dividends to the nation. It must be recognized that this is an ever challenging goal. The parent that needs the most help to assist his youngster is usually not the most active in the P.T.A. Parents need to be taught that the best thing they can spend on their children is not money but time.

The businessman that could be a great contributor to the cause has a tendency to be laggard in accepting his community educational responsibilities. Many successful businessmen are asked by teachers at all levels, "In your opinion, what courses in school contribute most to the successes in business?" Invariably, the individual being asked will list those courses he took. For over 30 years Sears has hired college graduates to train for future management positions, and for many years has kept careful records of the men selected. We have found two facts:

In administrative positions, the major field of study in college has no relationship to personal success or failure. With the exception of certain technical skills, a person is hired primarily for the ability he has shown to learn, and not for the specific knowledge he has gained.

Good grades do not necessarily represent expertness in a field. Rather, they often represent the ability and desire to learn.

What makes a successful employee? Sears has conducted much research on what makes an individual stand out as excellent. We have found that there are three major criteria which characterize men who are able to move up the line and to handle major responsibility successfully:

First, general intelligence, which is comprised of the ability to recognize various situations and the flexibility to cope with them.

Second, personality characteristics, such as emotional stability, combined with social skills and ability to persuade others.

Third, motivational drives, toward attainment and personal achievement.

You will note that I have placed the responsibility for meeting the challenge of excellence squarely on the shoulders of the parents and their son or daughter who must have the desire to learn, the teacher who must have the ability to teach, and the businessman. The latter must have the foresight to know that better students make better citizens, and better citizens produce better economies, and better economies produce better business. And that, of course, is where I came in.

Ladies and gentlemen, ours is a challenge of excellence that must and shall be met.

CHARACTERISTICS AND IDENTIFICATION

NATURE AND NEEDS OF THE GIFTED

by

Willard Abraham

One of the things which is most important in this field of gifted children is the fact that the neglect has continued for many years. Now both parents and teachers have reached a point where they are ready for action. In many parts of our country it has been a long time in coming, and in a few parts of our country, of course, the action has been in effect. We see some progress being made.

I'd like to consider first some of the kinds of mininformation, or lack of information, that we have related to gifted youngsters. The misunderstandings are tremendous.

But before I do that I want to comment on a Gallup Poll that took place some time ago which indicates that battle that has to be fought in the education of gifted children. People, chosen at random, were asked whether they were in favor of extra time being spent on slow youngsters in the schools, and then they were asked whether extra time should be spent on bright youngsters in schools. Of those queried, 86% said they were in favor of extra time being spent on slow youngsters, but when it came to bright youngsters the figure dropped to 26%. Relatively few people were in favor of spending more time on meeting the needs of our brighter youngsters. These youngsters are the ones on whom we will depend for the solution of our problems related to cancer, to world peace, and to many of the other needs we are coping with.

There are many people who hark back to the last century, when somehow into the literature of gifted children came the expression "They ripen early and they rot early." The feeling was that they mature very early and then begin to fall to pieces within a relatively short time span. No statement could be more in error. The Terman studies and many others indicate that gifted youngsters, as a rule, retain their giftedness into adulthood. They generally, as far as these studies which have been going on for years are concerned, retain their good health and brightness in adulthood, have more distinguished war records, and reach earning capacities higher than the average for our population. We can go right down the line of affirmative factors related to gifted youngsters and find out that, in general, they retain these affirmative factors in adulthood. Everybody knows one individual youngster who is bright but who is shorter than the other youngsters, who is more sickly, and who doesn't have any friends. The point I am making, though, is that in general they are above average in measurable traits, even though you, as an individual, may know some bright youngster who is below average in some measurable trait.

Another kind of misinformation is related to the idea of these youngsters "muddling through," that without any special help, without any special guidance, somehow they'll get through the educational program without any difficulty. Nothing could be more wrong. One of the figures that has been bandied around a great deal, and which we've no reason to dispute, is that about half of the top 25% of our high school graduates do not finish college. Now there is no reason why we should assume that everybody should go to college. This is one of the problems we have to cope with in many different ways. But to go along with the assumption that we can lose half of our brightest youngsters before they finish even a bachelor's degree in a reputable college is latching onto something that can cause us a lot of difficulty with these youngsters.

A third type of misinformation is related to the feeling on the part of many parents and many teachers of satisfaction if the bright youngster is working up to grade level. Let me pose a situation for you. Let's say we have a 10-year old child who is in the fifth grade doing fifth grade work adequately. His parents and teachers might be satisfied. On the other hand, what if this youngster has an I.Q. somewhere around 140, 150, or 160, and on the basis of other measures there is every indication that he is extremely bright? Should we be satisfied if he is working up to his regular grade level for his age or the average youngster of his age? I have a feeling that we should not. I have a feeling that maybe we ought to refer to this youngster as a "slow learner." That term has been used at the other end of the scale in the mental retardation picture. But really, if you think about it for a minute, I think you'll understand that if the youngster is bright but not working up to that capacity it really means he's learning more slowly than he is capable of learning. This can be a contribution to an eventual drop-out from school for this particular youngster.

One of the other problems we face related to gifted youngsters is a matter of terminology. We can get caught up in the problems of so called education "gobbledegook," arguing whether we're talking about the bright youngster or the gifted youngster, the above average youngster, or you choose your own term. The neglect is pretty general whether we're talking about the top part of one percent of our population, or whether we're talking, as Dr. James B. Conant has said, the top 15% to 20% of our population. We get caught up in other kinds of terminology problems. What do we mean by enrichment, for example? There are many teachers who say that they enrich the program of their youngsters in school, and yet what they're talking about is something that really should not be diginified by the term enrichment. A child does his work fast so he is "enriched" by getting 5 more problems. There's really not much of a benefit that he receives from this. We get caught up in terminology like acceleration. Years ago the word "skipping" fell into disrepute, and "acceleration" to some extent has taken its place. There are many schools that go along with the idea that a youngster should never be accelerated and never be held back. I'd like to hold out to you that maybe we ought to consider the needs of the particular youngster. In certain cases moving him ahead by letting him go ahead at his own pace may be the best thing that could happen for him, for his family, for the regular classroom teacher, and for the future of our country altogether. Let him move ahead at his pace. It has to be done on an individual basis, however. There is no question about that, but let us consider the fact that moving him ahead may be the best thing for him. Some people raise the question that when he gets to college he may be out of his element. He may be a year or two younger than the other youngsters who are entering college. Many studies such as the Ford Foundation studies and many others have indicated that even if they go to college early, most of them adjust very well academically and even socially.

Some people have this kind of misinformation: they assume that all bright youngsters are eccentric, or queer, or deviate in some other unpleasant way. This would have to depend on the youngster we are talking about. Gifted children as a group have quite a range in their personality patterns, as *any* children in a group would have. To say that bright youngsters have a hard time building up friendships could be disputed by many parents who know that this isn't so for their bright youngster, and by many teachers who certainly know it isn't so for many of the youngsters they teach. Gifted children frequently can and do have close friendship patterns, just as other youngsters do.

One of the statements that has been made by many people is that if we educate the gifted, other children suffer in the process. This could be so, but in general this is not the way it has worked out in the places where they have been attempting to do something special academically for bright youngsters. In general, when the educational program benefits the gifted child directly the other children have profited too. An opportunity has been created for the other youngsters to provide leadership when gifted children are pulled out of a particular academic setting and put into another one. When a special gifted child program is set up there may be more individualized attention for other children, more materials, more use of community facilities, and other affirmative reactions that accompany doing something special for bright youngsters.

I'd like to comment on something that has been considered a pretty questionable topic related to this whole subject. It is the accusation some people have made that to single bright children out for special attention is somehow undemocratic. It is only, it seems to me, when we single out *bright* youngsters for special attention that the accusation of being undemocratic comes up. I don't remember ever hearing it come up when we single out youngsters who are on a football team, those who go into art classes, those singled out for a chorus, choir, band, or an orchestra. But when we talk about intellectual giftedness this accusation somehow appears. One of the statements made in the literature of gifted children is that "there is nothing so unequal as equal treatment of unequals," the idea that *equal* opportunity doesn't necessarily mean the *same* opportunity. We have to realize that opportunities have to be adapted to the means of the particular youngster. Some people have said that if you single out bright children and put them with other bright children you help create a kind of "snob attitude." I'd like to ask you to think about this question: Which makes the bright child more snobbish, to be one of thirty children where all are quite bright and he has to fight academically to hold his place, or to be one of thirty children where he is by all odds the brightest in the crew? Which would make him feel more snobbish? Which would have a tendency to encourage him perhaps to look down on other children?

The subject of under-achievement and drop-outs has come up quite often related to gifted youngsters. I have already mentioned, for example, that about half of the top quarter of our high school graduates don't finish college. What is the cause of the drop-out rate that takes place with bright youngsters? Do the causes differ very much from those as they affect other children? I think we have to realize that many times the drop-out rate of bright and other youngsters is caused by a kind of accumulation of the trivial, very much as it is the cause of divorce. It doesn't happen all of a sudden. It is an accumulation over a period of many years. It may be a very poor first-grade teacher who contributes to the drop-out of the youngster at the age of sixteen. It may be his parents who contribute to his drop-out, and they may contribute in the very earliest years by saying to the youngster, "When you get to school you'll have to toe the mark" or warning him about the problems of a school environment. A man by the name of Earl C. Kelley, who has contributed to education for many years in many parts of the country, made this statement at a conference just a week or so ago. He said, "We talk about drop-outs but we don't even know how to count them. Most of them are still in school." I'd like you to think about that for a minute. Maybe the idea is that all of the drop-outs we're concerned about may not have left school. The dreamers, the deviates from the attitudes that we try to develop in children in school, these may be the drop-outs who are still there and whom we have to be concerned about. Certainly poor teaching and lack of guidance fit into the situation of increasing the drop-out rate. An unrealistic parental aspiration has fit into the situation too. There are many, many things that can be done. Certainly one of the things is to realize they need help just as other children need help. Just because they're smarter, just because they have tremendous insights, doesn't mean they can solve all of their problems. Unfortunately we assume they have maturity on their side and in many cases they don't. They need the help of an interested parent, an interested teacher, and an interested school system.

One of the things that ought to be mentioned is the one word "inspiration," and if you and I had a chance to discuss this personally you might debate with me on it. But I've had a feeling for a long time that one of the most important things in building up a sound educational attitude on the part of the bright youngster is to have somebody in a one-to-one relationship with him once in a while. It may be a good friend, it may be some adult in the school or home environment, it may be a neighbor. If you think back when you were an adolescent, for example, wasn't there somebody you could confide in, somebody you could tell things to, whom you could depend on for not sending these things on to somebody else? Sometimes this one-to-one relationship can help avoid development of a drop-out before it occurs. The identification of bright youngsters at the very earliest, in the pre-school and early school years, will be helpful in establishing a sponsor type relationship.

There is a need for recognizing that a grade, as it is given in school, may mean different things to different people. There is a need for recognizing that in many cases where there are honors classes it might be necessary to have weighted grades to give special credit for a youngster who is in a special class. I realize that we don't want to attach too much importance to grades, but I'll be willing to stop talking about grades related to children's attitudes when teachers and administrators are willing to stop talking about grades in connection with courses *they* take. This comes to me in so many directions, from people who teach on the college and university level, and the fact that parents and teachers and administrators attach a tremendous amount of importance to grades. We can't expect any less from the youngsters with whom we live and work.

Another approach, certainly to under-achievement and to solving the drop-out rate, has come through the work in New York City—the "Higher Horizons" project, where they've gone into some of the so-called less-chance neighborhoods. Efforts have been made to give the better teachers and the best guidance to the bright youngsters. What happened is that the drop-out rate has been cut, these youngsters have gone on to college much more than any record in the past has shown, and they've earned scholarships. A supposition on the part of some people that they could not cope with a college environment has been laid to rest. In the past many of them coming from a neglected home or school environment weren't able to make the grade. But with the additional help that comes through a project like the "Higher Horizons" project they have been able to show they have this ability to work ahead.

There are many other subjects related to the gifted child that I can bring up. Let me stress a few that I think you either have read about, have given consideration to, or maybe have in effect in some of your own schools.

For example, some systems use the ungraded school, or the ungraded primary, where youngsters are not in a particular grade level but they enter a two or three year primary grade grouping where they have the opportunity and are encouraged to move ahead more quickly at their own rate. They may spend all of this time of three years with the same teacher. Some people may find fault with that, but let's assume that it's a *good* teacher. Let us assume that in two or three years she can find out a great deal more about the youngsters than could three individual teachers. One of the good books in this field that you might want to look up sometime is the one by Goodlad and Anderson on the ungraded elementary school.

Another of the promising practices that has been in effect in some parts of our country is that of flexible school entry. I recognize it's a matter of administrative expediency to have cut-off dates for the admission of young children to school-to use December 31st or the end of October or November as the cut-off date. But I'm sure we're sophisticated enough to realize that all children on their sixth birthday are not the same height, the same weight, the same emotional maturity, and do not have the same capabilities of coping with an educational environment. A man by the name of D. A. Worcester in a little book called *The Education of Children of Above Average Mentality* has suggested (and it's been suggested in many other places) that we consider flexible school entry. Let us use the strict cut-off date, but let's have a kind of a buffer zone. The youngsters who might be just a little bit too young should be studied rather intensively through tests and other child study techniques to see whether perhaps they too could cope with the first year of school.

The idea of team teaching has come into the education of the gifted by adapting to the needs of youngsters on the basis of teachers who have the capabilities and the subject-matter background to work with them.

Automation has come into this situation too. This is based not just on teaching machines, which you may accept or reject because you like or don't like the idea of automation. But there is a contribution that is beginning to be made by the whole field of programmed learning, whether it is in machine form, in booklet form, or some other form. Let's recognize that it is coming and that it will be here to serve us, not to direct us. There are some teachers and administrators who object, and may have some basis in their own background for objecting to programmed learning, saying that this is going to replace the teacher. No such thing. I've never heard of any programming company or any psychologist who is interested in this say that it is a replacement for the teacher. It is not a replacement. It is an effort, if it is used soundly, to help teachers do a more effective job in certain elements of the curriculum.

More of our schools should consider the possibility of building up a professional library of materials related to the education of gifted children. If we just settle for identifying these youngsters it is not enough. We can identify them from now until doomsday and it won't do the job. It is necessary to identify them and then realistically and specifically try to develop academic and other programs to meet their needs. Our teachers can contribute to this, and our administrators certainly can contribute to it. It is a matter of adapting the very best techniques they know, refining them as they go along, and trying to give these youngsters the kind of an educational program that will serve them best in the years ahead.

One of the problems that I'm sure educators worry about in our schools, and parents worry about sometimes, is that perhaps teachers and administrators may be threatened by the fact that they will have youngsters in their schools who are intellectually brighter than they are. Parents worry because they have children who are intellectually brighter than they are. This is inevitable, but on the other hand, let's realize that we have maturity and knowledge on our side. We have to be careful in selecting our teachers, in evaluating how we prepare them. We must realize the limitations that our teachers have in covering all of the new information in the knowledge explosion that has taken place in the last 10 to 15 years, even in the last year. We have to realize that teachers and administrators need all the help and understanding that all of us as parents and as interested laymen can give them.

There is much research in the field of gifted children and I hope that in your professional libraries you'll look up some of these investigations, such as the Terman studies, the NEA Academically Talented Project, the North Central Association Carnegie Foundation Project on Superior and Talented Students, and many others. This is just a beginning and there is much more that I am sure you can do in this direction.

CREATIVITY

by

Laurence M. DeRidder

The future of our civilization, our very survival, depends upon the quality of the creative imagination of the next generation. Vance Packard in *The Status Seekers* suggests: "Our nation's educators, particularly at the public-school level, have perhaps the greatest responsibility in developing a greater circulation of talent. They are the arbiters of whether it is ever recognized and ignited in the first place."

In the past few years creative ideas in science have propelled us through the machine age to the atomic age and now into space. In the process they have outstripped corresponding advancement in the social science fields. The individuals who will solve our gigantic world-wide problems of today and tomorrow are at this very moment students in our classrooms. Anything that can be done to help these young people utilize their creative energies to attack important problems will be a step in the direction of a better world.

Creative thinking is a complex talent made up of many abilities such as recognizing problems, flexibility in thinking, inventing or organizing ideas, or finding new uses for old objects and materials. This is only one definition, and I think one of the better. I wanted to mention several so that you can get the flavor of the varieties of approaches that are currently being utilized in the literature.

Drevdahl, in a recent study, defined creativity (and I'll give you his short definition) as the capacity of persons to produce compositions, products or ideas of any sort which are essentially new or novel, again underscoring the *new* or *novel*, and previously unknown to the producer. In other words, they have to be really new. There has to be something added that hasn't been there before.

Flanagan (you perhaps have heard of John Flanagan and the Project Talent Tests of the University of Pittsburgh) defines creativity as the bringing forth of almost anything new in the way of an idea, a formulation, a model, a theory, or an esthetic or practical problem. Creativity is "the evoking something new into being." The process of creativity then is that process in which something new is born, so to speak. The emphasis is on newness and lack of previous existence of the idea or product.

One of the major researchers in the area of creativity has been J. P. Guilford of the University of Southern California. I will be speaking later about some of the kinds of things that he has been talking about. He has done a considerable amount of research in the area of creativity and has concluded that there are two different kinds of creativity, one which he labels "divergent" and the other "convergent" thinking. In other words he is saying there are two distinctive types of cognitive processes involved in creative problem-solving.

The convergent thinking he defines as certain cognitive abilities employed in the search of one correct solution to a given problem. This is what we normally find in most of our schools. We give the children a problem to do in which there is one solution. This is convergent thinking. The divergent thinking—and this we find increasingly emphasized as we look into the research literature—is defined as other congintive factors utilized in solving open-end problems, or problems in which there is no specific answer, a process which allows the student, therefore, to be going off in different directions in thought.

Now, who is creative? Well, fortunately, I found definitions in research that support the fact that we are all creative. We all fit into that category. Everyone, according to Guilford, can be creative to some degree in many ways—that heredity may set the limit, but practice is important. In other words, what we permit the children to do in our schools is important. Society's responsibility, therefore, is to provide favorable environment and education, and to give appropriate rewards for a creative production in order for it to be encouraged.

According to Russell, creative ability is a continuum from simple discovery to such high forms of inventiveness as indicated by Sir Isaac Newton.

How does creativity differ from talent? According to Dr. Magnifico, the creative individual must not be confused with the talented individual. "Talent employs an ability, or a performance that is readily observable. The talented individual has a degree of intelligence and bodily coordination which enables him to master one, or a number of complicated skills. He may, or may not, be superior intellectually. Accomplishment or talent, then, does not mean creative ability but merely sufficient mental ability to master or make use of certain skills. The talented person restructures or recreates. The creative person produces original material."

Now, how does the creative differ from (what we have been talking about this morning) the gifted child? Giftedness, in children, has been most frequently defined as a score on an intelligence test. Unfortunately, this is true. But this is as it has been. We have behaved as if the intelligence test represented an adequate sampling of all the mental abilities and cognitive processes. The typical intelligence test, however, actually significantly measures, according to Guilford, only about a half dozen factors, and many of these half dozen factors are not necessarily related to the measurement of creativity.

Despite the boader definition of the gifted individual by the American Association of Gifted Children, "A person whose performance in any line of socially useful endeavor is consistently superior," the I.Q. has continued to be the predominant and frequently only criterion of giftedness, both in research and in educational practice. Measures of I.Q. and measures of creativity have little or no correlation. According to Torrance (who is at the University of Minnesota doing a considerable amount of work in the exploration of creativity), in the upper ranges of intelligence there is practically no relationship between measures of intelligence and measures of creativity. However, groups varying widely in ability in intelligence do show low but statistically significant correlations, while low intelligence groups demonstrate relatively high correlations between their measures of intelligence and measures of creativity. Let's examine some of the reasons for this. Why should there not be any greater relationship between measures of creativity and measures of intelligence? Tests of intelligence, as we have known them to be, and scholastic aptitude tests emphasize logical reasoning, memory and convergent thinking, the ability to find a single correct solution to a problem that is presented. They emphasize conformity and getting the "correct" answer. Generally they use the multiple choice format for the measurement of this intelligence. Tests of creativity, on the other hand, emphasize ideational fluency, and by this I mean the extent to which a person can produce words (appropriate words) in a given period of time. They measure flexibility, ability to manipulate and see new approaches to the same situation. They measure originality. They measure elaboration. They measure sensitivity to defects or missing elements that might be in a situation. And they also measure a person's ability to redefine and to restructure the situation. Measures of creativity emphasize the unconventional response, the breaking away from the beaten, safe pathway. They are usually in an open-ended word associational format rather than a multiple choice, one-correct-answer format. If we were to identify children as gifted on the basis of intelligence tests alone, and this unfortunately is what is the norm in this state, Torrance estimates that we would eliminate approximately 70% of the creative individuals. In other words, if we use our present procedures, I.Q. tests, and our usual cutoff score, around 120 or so, as the basis of the identification of the gifted, we would, by so doing, eliminate approximately 70% of the most creative in the population.

Tests of creativity and tests of intelligence identify different types of gifted individuals. Torrance and his associates, again at the University of Minnesota, did multiple replications of a study done by Getzel and Jackson at the University of Chicago. Their study in Chicago identified two separate groups, a highly creative group in the upper 20% of their class in creative thinking, but who were not high in intelligence. Then they took the top 20% of those who were found to be the most intelligent, on the basis of the Stanford-Binet, but who were not in the top 20% of the creative group. They found that the mean I.Q. difference between the two groups was 25 I.Q. points. In other words, the creative group in our school tends to be quite different from the academically intelligent group, or the group as it is so frequently defined.

With the same group Getzel and Jackson and Torrance both found that when standardized achievement measures of these two groups, those who identified in the top 20% in creativity and the top

20% in I.Q., were compared that there is no significant difference between the two groups in their standardized achievement test results. In other words, individuals who are highly creative, but not necessarily highly intelligent, did just as well on tests of achievement as the individuals who are highly intelligent but not creative.

One of Torrance's associates, Yamamoto, found that I.Q.'s up to 120 make a difference on the academic achievement that students are able to demonstrate. Beyond this point, beyond 120, it appears that the extent of creativity that a person possesses makes the difference in added achievement, not the additional I.Q. In other words, if you have an I.Q. up to 120 you're likely to do as well as somebody else who has both an I.Q. up to 120 plus creativity. With a higher I.Q. you are likely to make a lower score, achievement-wise, than a person who has also a 120 I.. but greater creativity. It is the creativity aspect which makes the difference in terms of continued achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Now, despite the equivalent academic achievement of the two groups, their teachers, when asked to select the students in each group that they enjoyed working with, those they liked, and those they identified with, described the highly intelligent children as more desirable, better known, or better understood, more ambitious and more hardworking, more studious. In other words, the individuals who were identified as gifted were looked upon favorably by the teacher. Although the highly creative children apparently learn as much as the highly intelligent children, they do not appear to work as hard. They engage in activities which are frowned upon, and generally achieve despite the unaccepting learning environment provided them.

I'd like to go on one step further in terms of the implications of this. Getzel indicated that tests, recommendations and rank in class, now relied upon so heavily in college admissions, are biased in favor of the student with convergent intellectual ability and with convergent social interests. The good grade-getters often have little creative talent but get the bulk of the scholarship awards each year. They are the people who become the valedictorians, the salutatorians and get the scholarships. The creative child, somehow or other, gets lost.

Interestingly, I ran across an article in the February 24th issue of *Business Week* on "Good Scholars Not Always Best." This article stressed the same point. On the basis of three separate studies the authors conclude that our educational system, based as it is on scholastic achievement, may be eliminating some of the nation's best talent, and that the better potential scientists and engineers come from the lower levels of their college classes.

Now, what does a creative person look like? A summary of the clusters of characteristics related to creativity may be of assistance in abstracting and conceptualizing the "creative personality."

Highly creative persons are, in the main, well above average intellectually. They are alert, capable of concentrating attention readily and shifting it appropriately. They have a wide range of information at their command. Because of greater range of information and greater fluency of combination, such persons typically come up with unusual but appropriate responses. As a group, creative persons score intellectually well above average but individual scores range widely. However, no creative feebleminded person has been found. In other words, a rather high degree of intelligence is required for creativity but above that point intelligence does not seem to influence the amount of creativity evidenced.

In the school, studies have found a significant relationship between intelligence and creativity: creative children, with few exceptions, are superior in intelligence.

Openness to experience:

The creative person is characterized by his freedom of impulse and imagery, by an openness of feelings and emotions, by an understanding selfawareness and wide-ranging interests. As a result, being able to express rather than have to suppress or repress, he has fuller access to his own wealth of experiences and information and is able therefore to see complex equivalencies. Since the creative typically does not deny or repress things that are unpleasant or troubling, he tends to be seen as being frank and critical about himself, his family, and his problems. Creative persons tend to reveal a considerable amount of psychological turmoil, in part because they fully admit the existence of such problems, symptoms, and complaints. However, they also reveal, at the same time, that they have developed adequate ways of reacting to them.

As a group the creative are inclined to be interested and curious, open and receptive, and seeking of experiences; in other words, they are highly active in perceiving or in becoming aware.

The creative child in the classroom tends to be equally imaginative and independent in his fantasy production, making liberal use of humor and unexpected endings. Although not preferred by the classroom teacher, he usually is popular among his peers. He sees himself as shy, popular, creative, and imaginative.

Intuitive:

The creative person typically goes behind the facts, behind what is presented to his senses, for the deeper meanings and possibilities, for that which is capable of occurring but not yet realized. He is relatively less interested in small details and facts as such and much more concerned with their meanings and implications.

Courage to be:

The creative person has to a large degree realized his potentialities. He has become what he is capable of becoming in part because he is relatively free from conventional restraints and inhibitions. His own set of values and ethical standards are his basis for judgment. He is consequently independent, particularly in the areas of creative striving. Where conforming behavior is expected or required, he, in turn, tends to be also quite conventional. It is interesting that no evidence of homosexual tendencies has been reported.

In the school room, the creative child is indifferent toward group standards and the perceived teacher-ideal in his school performance. This nonconformity is again expressed in his unconventional career choices.

An emotional concern with form and beauty and with truth permeates all of a creative person's work. He seeks solutions to his problems which are not only appropriate but also elegant. If he has a choice between the simple and complex, he will choose the more challenging, the more unsolvable, the more unfinished, the unbalanced, the asymmetrical, the abstract.

Rather than supporting the popular belief that highly creative individuals are generally eccentric, unstable, and emotionally maladjusted, current research results indicate that the creative individual tends to be stable, mature, realistic, self-reliant, confident and serious. Only to the extent that freedom from group dependency and a tendency to withdraw introspectively are considered peculiar could the creative individual be described as eccentric or "different" in a socially undesirable direction. To summarize, using the description by Donald MacKinnon of the University of California, the creative individual is characterized by his openness to experience, his freedom from crippling restraint and impoverishing inhibitons—the kind of things with which we surround so many students in our schools—his aesthetic sensitivity, his cognitive flexibility (in other words, his ability to think fluently with words), his independence and thought in action, his high level of creative energy, his unquestioning commitment to creative endeavor (in other words, he wants to create—he *must* create) and his unceasing striving for solutions to ever more difficult problems, if he is so permitted.

I would next like to talk about how we find these individuals in our school or in our society. How can we identify them? How do we know when we have one? And then, beyond this, of course, the biggest problem, what can we do about it? Let me briefly talk about what the identification process might be and then, as a panel, we might like to talk about what can we, individually, do. You may have heard that some tests of creativity are currently available—some are now in published form. I brought along the address of those developed by Dr. J. P. Guilford. They can be obtained from the Sheridan Supply Comapny in Beverly Hills, California. He has six tests of fluency, flexibility and originality. He has some other tests on which he is trying to get further research done and some tests which are still not published. These you can get from him directly. But he is very interested in trying to find out to what extent his tests do select individuals which can be identified as creative by other means, also. Some additional tests are currently available, or will be available very shortly as soon as the books come out. Dr. Torrance, whose book I referred to briefly a while ago, will have his book published some time this spring. The book's title is, *Guiding Creative Talent* and will be published by Prentice-Hall. He has in this book descriptions of the tests that he currently is using. These are, as far as I know, not copyrighted, and you could very easily utilize them in your classrooms. Dr. Torrance has created a sequence of at least seven tests to identify various aspects of creativity.

Another sequence of tests which are available through the book written by Getzels and Jackson, of the University of Chicago. The book's title is *Creativity and Intelligence* and was published by John Wiley this spring. In the appendix of this book there is a sequence of another variety of tests created by Getzels and Jackson at Chicago to identify creativity in the research population with which they were working. At least three different groups of tests, then, are available—Getzels and Jackson's, Torrance's and Guilford's. There are most likely others currently available.

Now, assuming that you didn't want to go into a test procedure, what can you do in the classroom, or as a parent, or as an interested service agency within the community to identify creativity? I have selected from the literature at least 25 characteristics, some of these being more important than others, which you as an interested observer could utilize as basic criteria of creativity. The first six or seven are the most important. They differ from those which currently are available for the identification of the gifted. In other words, these are cosely related to creativity itself.

As we know from research results already mentioned, a person must first have average or better intelligence to be labeled creative in terms of the way these tests define it.

Number two would be the ability to produce a large number of ideas per unit of time. In other words, a person who can think of a lot of things to do when given an opportunity. This is labeled ideational fluency.

The third would be the ability to use a variety of approaches. In other words, there is no one way, but many ways, to any goal and this person is able to tell you several solutions possible. This is labeled flexibility.

A fourth—ability to abstract, to analyze, to redefine, to restructure, to synthesize. Individuals are creative who can see or understand what other have difficulty in understanding; who can put things together in a different way that they have been put before, who see equivalencies between things. This is known, in the literature, as elaboration.

A fifth would be the ability to produce unusual, surprising, off-the-beaten-track ideas. In other words, he comes up with things whether you ask for him to come up with them or not. He goes off by himself, or he has wild ideas. A person who is alert to what could be, or the not-yet-realized, is a person who can come up with something new and novel—this is labeled originality.

A sixth would be sensitivity to problems; this appears to be related to something I said earlier: the ability to see problems or discrepancies overlooked by others. This includes ability to see accurately and to accept what others repress. The creative person is willing to look at his own feelings and express them. He is able to become a part of the problem field. In other words, he begins to feel the problem, he goes along with it, he is carried by the tide, so to speak. He senses its forces, he follows its leads, he goes to wherever the solution might be, and sometimes that might be out of your room. He is just not with you.

A seventh would be the ability to select out possible answers in terms of degree of excellence or fitness.

Others on the list, of less importance perhaps, but helpful in describing the person we call creative are:

Highly curious.

Autonomous, noncomforming in ideas, independent in thinking.
Self-sufficient, self-reliant.
More open in feelings and emotions, emotionally mature.
Having preference for the complex; able to manipulate many interrelated ideas at the same time.
Following own interests and setting goals for self often in conflict with those set by the class; playing with things and ideas, following own impulses.
Self-starting—furnishing own motivation.
Highly determined; tending consequently to conflict with established authority; giving but not giving up ; persevering, stubborn.
Placing high value on form and beauty and truth; placing low emphasis on the economic aspects.
Intuitive.
Resisting group work.
Thorough in area of consuming interest but not at all in areas unimportant to him.
Often appearing lazy, at least not visibly busy.
Maybe not getting his work in on time because of pursuit of own idea rather than of unimportant deadline.
Highly sincere.
Critical of others, but usually constructively.
Possessing good sense of humor, but not always one that endears them to group.
Having more varied and sometimes unrealistic career choices.

What often happens among the highly creative in our schools?

1. They are isolated from their teachers and from their peer group
   a. Teachers do not know what to do with answers or approaches different than expected and react "It doesn't look like it to

me," "Why did you have to do that?" (The creative have an unusual talent for disturbing the class organization.)

b. Peer groups label the creative child's questions and answers as silly or crazy.

2. Frequently they are puzzled by their own behavior; their heightened sensitivity, ability to be disturbed, and unusual thinking makes them wonder about themselves. They are given the explanation, "When you are older you'll understand."
3. They are frequently squelched when they try to talk about their ideas; "It's time for the Bluebirds to read."
4. They are penalized for not thinking or acting convergently by our tests and by the teachers:
   "You'll have that next year if you pass."
   "Those of you who miss more than five will have to stay in during recess."
5. Teachers prefer in the classroom the child who has a high I.Q. over the child who is highly creative. The former does what he believes his teacher would approve; the latter does what he approves. Teachers hold up as models the high I.Q. pupils who behave, who come up with the right answers, who give the socially accepted solutions to problems.

What can parents-teachers-guidance workers do to encourage the creative?

1. Do not force togetherness. Permit them not to be "well-rounded." De-emphasize group participation. Distinguish between healthy solitude and preferred separateness as compared to morbid withdrawal and compulsive isolation.
2. Provide maximum opportunities to work out his own interests, even if it means working alone.
3. Creative children need high security plus opportunity to be jarred by the unexpected, by an uncertainty; therefore provide problems which require the mind to stretch while providing psychological safety and psychological freedom.
4. Reward curiosity by respecting his questions. Stimulate the child to continue to explore, to ask good questions, to make good guesses at answers, to test the answers against reality. Encourage intellectual playfulness, ability to deal inventively. Seek opportunities to call for divergent rather than convergent thinking. The creative needs to keep discovering.
5. Allow him to use his imagination freely in role playing, telling fantastic stories, making unusual drawings. A class newspaper or magazine containing the ideas produced by pupils helps to encourage acceptance of the creative.

6. Encourage independence, initiative, resourcefulness. Distinguish between independence and individuality as distinguished from unruliness and rebelliousness. Give greater rather than less autonomy to the creative.

7. Try to help him understand himself and his divergence from others to the extent he accepts himself and has the "courage to be."

8. Provide him an opportunity to communicate his ideas, what he has found out. Help him to become productive in his non-conformity. Communicate your feeling that he is a person of worth in his own right no matter what his present condition or behavior. Try to see his world as he sees it.

9. Use homogeneous grouping for tasks requiring creative problem solving to reduce special stress and enable the less creative to become more productive.

10. Emphasize reading and analyzing research creatively in terms of constructive possibilities rather than critically in terms of defects.

11. Encourage self-initiated learning with appropriate recognition for such achievements (honors program).

12. Provide support in resisting the dangers of too early a choice of career; support him in his tentativeness.

13. Reduce rote learning, drill, emphasis on unrelated facts and stress transfer of learning, applications, common principles, symbolic equivalencies.

14. Reward discovery as well as memory by making better achievement tests. Use knowledge, discovery, and wisdom as goals rather than information, repetition, and facts.

According to Torrance, other ways to create conditions for creative thinking include:

1. Free individuals from the threat of immediate evaluation; external evaluation tends to threaten and lessens the ability or willingness to explore. Recognize that the value of the product for the creative person is established by himself, not by external praise or criticism. Encourage novel responses appropriate to the situation.

2. Provide conditions which make individuals comfortable psychologically. Allow them to laugh, to be childish, to be dependent, to fantasy. Make work fun. Encourage an openness to experience.

3. Make learning and doing exciting; use practice experiences, group competition, etc.

4. Make warm-up progressive.

5. Make it legitimate to think boldly, to produce original or wild ideas, reward or approve the unusual. Encourage toying with elements and concepts.
6. Permit one thing to lead to another; let it happen; stretch the imagination.
7. Communicate your liking and love for the individual involved, letting him know you are on his side; the too frightened, too uncertain child cannot think well.
8. Encourage creative rather than critical evaluation by peers. Permit the individual to be in an atmosphere where he is not being evaluated or measured by some external standard. "Off the record" or "just for fun" practice tends to produce greater originality, elaboration, and sensitivity.

What are some of our immediate needs and jobs to do as parents, teachers, and guidance workers? We need to do research on:

1. Tests for assessing creative thinking abilities.
2. Tests for assessing growth in creativity.
3. Skills for setting the conditions which free the creative abilities children do have.
4. Effects of various teaching and guidance methods and procedures on the development of creative thinking abilities.
5. Tests for identifying teachers with strong creative motivations and attitudes.
6. Improving in-service programs in schools to the end that principals and teachers are helped to identify and to encourage the development of creative thinking.

IDENTIFICATION AND TESTING

by

Ernest McDaniel

Mark Twain is fond of telling the story about a visitor who died and went to heaven. Upon arrival there the visitor made a request of St. Peter to see the most famous general who ever lived. St. Peter pointed to an angel who was conveniently nearby. The visitor exclaimed: "Why, that's no general. I knew that man in real life; he was just a cobbler!" St. Peter replied, "Well, had he been a general, he would have been the greatest general in all th world." Perhaps this story illustrates the motivations of all of us here today and serves to point up our task. Namely, how can we identify those who might have been or might become the leaders, great scientists, generals, artists, or creative writers of tomorrow. I think the best answer is perhaps the shortest and most obvious one. We can identify these potentially capable people by using the testing programs which are now available.

I am referring to the intelligence tests now widely administered in almost every public school system. No doubt, to the test score itself, we would want to mix in a generous helping of school records and season well with teacher judgment. We would want to make a mental correction for the socio-economic biases which are built into the test. For example, as an arbitrary rule of thumb, one may be justified in adding ten points to the I.Q. score of any known retarded reader, of any Negro child, or of any child whose family has a gross annual income of less than $3,500 a year. Please remember that these approximate corrections are added *mentally*—we are never justified in *recording* a score other than that actually earned by the student. With such crude corrections the intelligence tests remain one of our best screening devices for the identification of potentially gifted youngsters.

Despite our ability to identify with a fair degree of accuracy the able youngsters in our school systems, there is growing evidence that we are not able to realize the potentialities indicated by the tests. In one study of 4,900 bright high school students in the New York City area, it was estimated on the basis of school records that 54% of the boys and 33% of the girls were achieving well below their predicted levels. Frankel, studying a limited number of bright boys of high school age, offers among other conclusions the fact that the pattern of underachievement is frequently evident in the junior high school performance. Barrett, another investigator in this area, finds the pattern of underachievement present as far back as the fifth grade. Shaw and McCuen state that underachievement often has its genesis in the first grade of elementary school. Winterbottom, in an unpublished Ph.D. thesis at the University of Michigan feels that under achievement may be traced even further back: to the training which the mother gives the young child in independence and self-reliance. Rosen and D'Andrade echo Winterbottom's findings and suggest that young children who later achieve in accordance with their potentialities have received, during pre school years, training in achievement and independence; i. e., training to do a job right and to do it by oneself.

It should be added at this point, that we are not making recommendation to parents. We are simply reviewing some of the research in this field, and any conclusions drawn are to be regarded as tentative. Certain very strong recommendations regarding gifted student programs, however, do seem to be suggested by these studies:

1. I.Q. tests, with certain limitations, do seem to indicate potential.
2. These potentials are realized by perhaps only half of the boys and two thirds of the girls.
3. Those who are not realizing their potentialities are behaving in response to certain adjustment patterns, values, or life styles which are laid down rather early in life.

This latter implication suggests to me that the big push on identification of gifted students should come early, perhaps between grades 3 and 6. Secondly, the findings suggest that in addition to any modification of the school program, perhaps the major impact will be made by a team of psychologists, social workers, and consulting psychiatrists working with the parents of the gifted child.

For those individuals who don't like tests, there is an alternative procedure for identifying gifted youngsters. This procedure is suggested by Paul Brandewine in a small book, *The Gifted Student as a Future Scientist*. Dr. Brandewine suggests that we let the gifted student identify himself. The gifted student does this by coming forward and asking to participate in opportunities to explore, to experiment, and to be creative. For example, arrangements may be made with an industrial chemist to meet students in the laboratory after school closes. Students who respond to such an invitation and actually arrive at the laboratory have identified themselves as wanting explorations which go beyond the confines of conventional school work. As another example, a music teacher may announce regular meetings of all students who would like to try their hand at actually composing their own music. Among the students who register for such an opportunity are likely to be the children who are potentially gifted in the area of music.

I like Paul Brandewine's suggestion because it focuses our attention on the need for specific opportunities in which students may give their creative energies full play. Without such opportunities test scores are as useless as bottled dust.

I have a feeling that one of the more effective ways of broadening opportunities for gifted students is through the introduction of a much greater amount of flexibility in the classroom as we work with all students. In order to gain this flexibility we as teachers and parents will have to give up some of our treasured assumptions concerning the nature of education and the way in which it may be best carried on. Some of the assumptions, it seems to me, are so out of touch with reality that we may appropriately label them as myths. Among these may be listed the grade level myth, the text book myth, and the myth of uniform standards.

The grade level myth is based on the assumption that children who have been in school an equal number of years will be pretty much alike and should be able to receive and profit from identical instruction. In contrast to this myth we have a half century of research which consistently points to the fact that with each passing year of school the children within a group become more and more different from each other. As summarized by Lindquist: "The range in achievement at the first-grade level is between three and four years; at the fourthgrade level, between five and six years; and at the sixth-grade level, between seven and eight years, in the areas of rading comprehension, vocabulary, the mechanics of English composition, literary knowledge, science, geography, and history." This indicates that by the sixth grade, children are not working at a single grade level in a certain subject and clearly suggests that some five to six levels of instructional material must replace the single text commonly in use.

One of the reasons we are reluctant to substitute individualized materials for the text is a belief that the textbook contains the facts which are important at a particular grade level. This is the textbook myth. It rests on the assumption that education is largely a matter of getting facts out of books and into heads. By way of contrast, Alfred North Whitehead, the distinguished mathematician and philosopher, suggests that education has something to do with the way the mind behaves when it is poked up into activity. Certainly, facts must be used as the students learn to develop hypotheses, support conclusions, analyze problems, or synthesize data. If, however, one of our primary aims is to develop these intellectual skills, it may matter much less than we have believed which set of facts the learner deals with in the process.

Finally, there is the myth of uniform standards. It is the feeling that all children should be judged and evaluated on the same criteria, whether the I.Q. of the child is 70 or 140, inhibits the introduction of flexibility in the class room. Studies suggest that up to 80 per cent of the teacher's free time is spent with children who are below grade level in what is often a futile attempt to bring them up to unrealistical levels of achievement. Meantime, the gifted sit. Standards are needed, of course. But these are best defined for each individual student in recognition of the capacities which he brings to the classroom.

If we could visit a classroom which had completely abandoned the myths of grade levels, textbooks, and uniform standards, we might notice youngsters of about the same age all learning about the discovery of America. One boy with a special interest in mathematics and an I.Q. of 157 is preparing a report on the navigational aids available at the time. Three students with I.Q.'s of around 135 are studying social-economic factors which stimulated the age of exploration. A girl with an I.Q. of 120 is looking up myths and legends of the sea. A group of seven students is reading a rather conventional treatment of Columbus' voyage. Four students with I.Q.'s centering around 85 are preparing a report on the size and simple details of construction of the ship that carried Columbus across the Atlantic. One boy with an I.Q. of 78 is making a wall poster of the foods eaten by the crew at a time when refrigeration and canning were unknown.

In this mythical class each student is dealing with questions and working with material commensurate with his own ability. In my opinion this would be the finest kind of gifted student program—as well as the finest kind of program for all students. Oh yes, I almost forgot: identification is not likely to be much of a problem for this kind of teacher.

EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS

MOTIVATION AND GUIDANCE

by

John D. Greene

All of us are born into a culture which houses and shapes our bioligical natures. Very soon we develop a self with feelings, with values, with aspirations. This self is also a potent force in our perceiving, behaving, and becoming. In our leadership roles of dealing with children and youth, we must understand the forces that impinge on them from without and from within. These forces seem to be the factors that influence motivation, a timely topic but not an easy one.

All of us, including children and youth, have similar physical, social, and psychological needs. As we look at the human being, we see *first*, a physical being which is described by the research and readings in physiology and biology. *Second*, we have a human being who is an integral part of his culture, as shown by the disciples of sociology and cultural anthropology. And *third*, we have a human being who is a self with feeling, values, and aspirations in life, and this area is represented by the disciplines of psychology and the more recent field of psychiatry. For depth and understanding of motivation, it is necessary for us to look at the underlying factors, and as we do we will find one of the following:

1) physical factors as a basis for motivation, or

2) cultural factors as a basis for motivation, or

3) self factors as a basis for motivation, or more likely,

4) a combination of interaction of these three factors.

All of us have common physical, social, and self needs which are the bases for our motives. It follows that we can learn a great deal abóut one person that will help us in understanding and working with another person. In fact, to understand what motivates one 5th grade boy will be helpful in coping with the motivational factors of other 5th grade boys. This is why the concept of common developmental tasks which applies to all human beings has been helpful. However, let's not be misled and think this is the whole picture. Granted that we do have these common needs which serve to motivate us, there is the other side of the coin. To complete the picture we must come to grips with the individualized, unique way that a child, youth, or adult meets his common motivational needs. For example, we may all have the universal physical need for food to satisfy the hunger drive. However, the particular food including variety and amount will be different for each person. To bring this closer home, we might illustrate by saying that most of us had the common physical need for food this morning, but what we ate in satisfying this need was entirely an individual matter.

We can further illustrate this matter of common and unique factors by looking at the socio-psychical need for belonging. There is a universay common need for acceptance, to feel that one belongs to some type of peer group; yet, the individual determines the source as well as the type of peer group to which he wishes to belong.

Thus it follows that any program designed to help children and youth in their "becoming" must take into account the common universal needs of youth, but at the same time, take into account the unique ways the learner tries to fill these common needs.

Briefly let us turn to another big area in which we will find motivational forces, the culture or the society. Studies pertaining to cultural background, ethnic origin, and social class of children and youth are pertinent to our discussion. Much can be learned about motivation, overachieving as well as underachieving, from these studies. However, I must inject a personal bias. From these studies as well as from talks and the literature, reference is made over and over to the "culturally deprived" or as sometimes called "culturally gray." To me there is no such thing. A human being cannot grow up without being a part of some type of society or culture. As I have seen and heard the term used, "culturally deprived" refers to almost anyone who grows up in a different culture from one's own and has developed different values. Yet that person's culture is as important to him as another, and to infer that he is deprived is not quite the right term. In fact, the term has a negative note and though we may intellectually accept the child, we are likely to reject him in our feelings and actions. Thus our effectiveness as leaders is lessened because the corollary of helpfulness is acceptance. Let us take a look at some of the research pertaining to the so-called culture or society including the family and its values, and its relationship to academic achievement.

1) Strodtbeck, F. L., in a study, "Implication of the Study of Family Interaction for the Prediction of Achievement," found that religious values had a direct bearing on achievement. The Jewish group had the highest achievement, the white Protestants second highest, the Irish Catholics third highest, and the Italian Catholics fourth highest.

2) Dorothy Lee, the cultural anthropologist, reported on a 1948 study conducted in my own state of Louisiana. In New Orleans, almost all Jewish people between 16 and 25 years of age had finished elementary school, which included grade 8. In this same age bracket, only 1/5 of the total "white" population had completed the same. In addition, 80% of the Jews had attended college a minimum of one year, whereas 25% of the "whites" had the same level of education.

3) The family plays a part in motivation and achievement. Anne Roe, in a study of 59 outstanding scientists, found that one of the common characteristics of the families from which these scientists came was that "learning was valued for its own sake."

From these studies we have seen that if the family and society put a high premium on achievement, the students will learn to live up to that expectation. Our schools are a part of the culture, and we might ask if the school puts a high premium on scholastic achievement. The old proverb that "action speaks louder than words" is apropos. Let us look at ourselves and see who received recognition in the school. I am not necessarily promoting honor societies, gold stars, or blue ribbons for academic achievement, but the more fundamental question is, "Do we value learning?" Action again speaks louder. Where do we invest the most money in our schools?

In spite of the so-called deprivation of the culture, the ethnic background, and low social class, some way and somehow certain individuals have emerged from deplorable social conditions to become rather outstanding individuals. A great part of the achievement of these individuals was due to certain self factors that came into play. The person got the idea that he could do things and developed the joy of learning by possessing a yen for discovery. Having a more positive view of himself, he unfolded to become a more self-actualized person in his own right. Looking at the forces in the self area and some of the research, we find a positive view of self is important in achievement. In fact, some authorities, such as Combs, Rogers, and Kelley believe that the way we see ourselves, our self attitudes or self-perception, will prove to be the most significant factor in the prediction of future behavior. Several studies seem to support this hypothesis:

1) Passow, Goldberg, and associates at the Horace Mann Lincoln School of Experimentation found that achievers and underachievers had no significant differences in what they wished to become, but that underachievers saw themselves weak in intellectual and problem-solving areas including self-confidence, eagerness to learn, judgment and working independently.

2) In the follow-up to the famous Terman study as reported in "The Gifted Child Grows Up," a report was made of the top and bottom fifth of the original 750 gifted students in terms of their success in life this was done 25 years after the original study). It was found that intellect and achievement are far from perfectly correlated, and that the greatest difference between the achievers and nonachievers was in the drive to achieve and in all-around social adjustment (the latter including positive self-perception).

There are other studies that have been completed and others underway, such as those pertaining to extrinsic vs. intrinsic motivation, creativity and high achievers, and motivation by failure vs. success experiences. Nevertheless we need much additional information. Since you and I have to operate on the best we know at this time, let's look at some of the practices as they relate to our subject.

As we look I am reminded of a recent statement made by Gordon Mackenzie at the ASCD Research Institute: "There seems to be tremendous public pressure that seems to imply that we will go forward in education by moving backward, and by picking up old solution and old answers. We rush to homogeneous grouping; we rush to tracking systems; we rush to more of the same things . . . greater quantities, making it harder as through these are essentially the best solutions to our problem."

What we do with reference to motivation, what we do with reference to the underachiever, and what we do for any student whether he be dull, average, or bright depends on our fundamental belief about youth and about learning. By the time you have reached our ages, you are oriented primarily toward one of the two "p's," i.e., primarily toward *program* or primarily toward *people*. If you primary focus is toward program, i.e., seeing program first and people second, then your action or what you do will be quite different from the leader who puts people first and program second. Let me say it another way and at the same time exemplify another bias. What we have done in the local school system of which I am a part is to focus on the individual and groups using research, knowledge, and understanding in helping each student to become in keeping with his abilities, aptitudes, and aspirations. Program though vital is secondary, and it is adjusted to the student and his needs. Our emphasis has been on quality teaching that makes a difference in the life of each youngster whether he goes to Yale when he graduates or paddles a pirogue up and down the bayou. For survival of our civilization we need to see that each of our students unfolds to the fullest. This means that those with technical aptitudes must develop their potential whether they become a scientist of a mechanic. Yet technology and scientific "know how" will not save us because man in his endeavor to control elements in the universe has developed instruments by which he can destroy himself. So we also need humanitarians and a well-adjusted society with individuals who are self-accepting enough not to have scapegoats; we need persons who can live in harmony with self and others.

Quality teaching and guidance (capitalizing on motivation and development of the individual in keeping with his unique abilities, aptitudes, and aspirations) do not just happen. It takes dedicated work on the part of each person concerned with the educative process. As we try to improve the quality of teaching and guidance, being fully aware of motivational factors, we stress the importance of our most sacred trust, the child.

TEACHING THE GIFTED

by

Walter B. Barbe

Concern for the education of the gifted has progressed through several stages. Beginning first with a concern for idnentification, research progressed next to a study of the characteristics of gifted children. A logical follow-up of this phase, was the obvious plea for special educational opportunities for the gifted which would assure maximum development of their potential. The development of programs of education for gifted children came next. Unfortunately, many such programs were administrative devices, rather than programs specifically designed for the development of talent. The phase into which we now find ourselves moving is that designed to point out clearly those teaching techniques which are effective with gifted children.

It is important to understand that the current emphasis on the education of the gifted does not somehow imply a lack of concern for the education of all children. Only to the extent that we can demonstrate that special provisions for the exceptional are also beneficial for other children, can we justify special education for any one particular group. The education of the mentally retarded in special classes has received widespread acceptance primarily because such programs not only benefit the mentally retarded but also provide the regular classroom teacher with the opportunity to do a better job for other children. The mentally retarded in the regular classroom required far more of the teacher's time than could ever be justified by his potential, often did not benefit from the kind of instruction which he was receiving, and was frustrating to the teacher who was not adequately trained to meet his special needs. Special education of the gifted parallels this in many ways.

The gifted child frequently already knows the material which the teacher must present to the other children in the class. Because she has so many children the teacher often finds it difficult to differentiate instruction for children of varying abilities. Either the gifted child is ignored because he can master the same material with less attention from the teacher, or the teacher ignores the other children in an attempt to challenge the gifted.

More and more there is an acceptance of the fact that at least for a short period of time each week, grouping children on the basis of potential is a valuable procedure. Perhaps the most important value of even partial grouping is the fact that it necessitates identification. There is clear-cut evidence that identification alone results in beneficial behavior change. Being with one's intellectual peers, even for a brief period of time, also produces beneficial attitudes. Being aware that there are others of equal or greater ability, rather than fostering snobbish attitudes, actually produces the opposite attitude.

But even more than just the value of being identified and being with one's intellectual peers, the types of activities in the special group are essentially different from those in the regular classroom situation. Not just longer assignments, nor more harder assignments, but actually a different approach to learning is clearly indicated. It is at the level of teaching the gifted that many of the so-called gifted program are failing.

Creativity is the "big word" in education today, but the assumption that it is merely another subject, somehow to be added to the curriculum like another subject would be added, is absurd. The goal of teaching the gifted should be to assist the student in acquiring an inquisitive attitude, a respect for learning, and the freedom to use the abilities which he has. The necessary skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening are learned, not as an end in themselves, but as tools to aid in the acquisition of desired and needed information. Merely the accumulation or amassing of facts is not the goal.

How then does teaching differ for the gifted? Briefly, the emphasis is not upon the end result or the product, but is instead upon the learning process itself. The "content bounds" are not determined by the teacher's knowledge, the text book or the curriculum guide, but instead are determined by the students themselves. The teacher no longer can know more about every subject than all or most of her students, but must instead recognize that there will be many of her students who will be better informed in one or many specialized areas than she is. Merely keeping one page ahead of her students is not possible. The teacher's role, therefore, is to become a learner-participant, as opposed to the role of leader-participant in the regular classroom. Evaluation of the student's progress is based upon his involvement in the learning process, not upon the quantitative measurement of how many isolated facts he may have memorized. If, by this approach to teaching, the gifted child is freed from the lock-step pace of much of formal education, then he may develop the ability to seek unique solutions to problems and, indeed, even discover unique problems. This, then, will result in creative thinking.

CURRICULUM FOR THE GIFTED

by

Virgil S. Ward

The gifted child in the American school has been without doubt neglected. He has been misunderstood. He has been victimized by the misconception that the democratic ideal of equality prohibits differential provisions according to ability. A striking irony has been observed in the fact that the most educable child in the American school is frequently the most retarded child in terms of grade placement. The consequent pool of unrealized talent and unfulfilled aspirations is actually a black mark against democracy, and it is a social loss of first magnitude. We have a statement by Leta Hollingworth, an early student in this field, which can and should influence our thought in behalf of the able and talented youngster. She says: "More and more it becomes clear that human welfare on the whole is much more a matter of the activity of deviates than it is a matter of what the middle mass of persons does."

My effort on this occasion with you will be to delineate some guide lines, positive and constructive, through which curricula content and instructional methods that exist can be evaluated for their adequacy, and through which a content and method which promise better to accomplish the particularized endeavor can be worked out. There is one overriding guideline that must discipline every specific effort to reshape the curriculum toward the needs of gifted youth. This governing criterion I term the "principle of relative uniqueness." This concept simply means that if a given experience (an activity, an assignment, an enrichment unit, an elective course) is fairly to be considered an element comprising special education for the gifted person, it must be distinctive in nature. It must be equally as distinctive, analogously, as are the qualities of mind are social role which typically distinguish gifted persons from those of more moderate abilities.

Individuals with marked specific talent or superior general intellect may be thought of as "reconstructionists:" That is, adventurers in ideas, inventors of things, creators of thought and action, and frontiersmen in general on the advancing fronts of human inquiry into the still hidden realities of nature. They advance human welfare through forward thrusts in basic science and related technology in engineering, health, and home appliances. They advance this welfare through basic thought that points the way to the larger fulfilment of the human spirit in architecture, painting, music, theology, and mental health. And it is from their ranks that will come leaders in the advance that nations, yellow, brown, and white, must make in learning to live with each other cooperatively, rather than antagonistically and destructively.

The problem of the curriculum is to carve out a sequence of experiences that extends over the full range of school years and carries into every major field of knowledge, which sequence will provide for those youngsters who qualify for an elevated and transformed plane of experience that involves their higher levels of learning and thinking and which points toward their anticipated adult role of social reconstruction. An adequately differentiated curriculum must take into account both the youngster's present extraordinary capacity for learning all sorts of things and the kinds of careers toward which these differences tend to lead. Properly disciplined thought in this direction, properly imaginative endeavors, and a proper courage for the rigorous effort required to bring about the changes essential to the task presents perhaps the most formidable challenge that exists for educators in the first quarter of a century of the space age.

The search must be sustained until relative adequacy is attained in devising those kinds of differential experience needed by the gifted individual for self-realization and for social contributions of the knd which only he can offer. Gifted children need some of the same knowledge that others do, and not all standard instructional techniques are a waste where they are concerned. Wherever standard materials and processes are apparently pertinent by their nature, however, they can and should be modified to take account of the differences in degree of capacity which characterize the abler learners. The problem would be awkwardly and only partially solved in dropping the high school curriculum to the elementary grades for exceptionally intelligent youngsters. They could accomplish it, but both the quality of the experience involved and the too-rapid acceleration through the school would render this single medium an ill-advised choice. Now, in the principles that follow, an endeavor will be made to point up certain qualitative characteristics which the differential experience, occurring on a transformed plane, should possess. We shall consider first the objectives of education and indicate how the objectives of education of bright youngsters must be particularized; then the content of the curriculum, indicating suggestively and illustratively how content must be changed; and, lastly, how teaching methods must be adapted in view of the unique nature of the pupil.

There are those who argue that it is unnecessary to derive an additional set of objectives for such groups of exceptional youngsters as may be purposefully identified. I do not subscribe to this point of view. Gifted children are children, to be sure, with all the species characteristics of mankind. However, the group is identified from the general ranks for chosen purposes. Similarly, to identify from within the framework of general objectives that pertain to all children, certain objectives made possible by the salient characteristics and needs of the gifted group, would seem to be logically just as necessary to the chosen purpose. A full body of such particularized objectives has not been developed and cannot be offered here. Illustrations of the kinds of ideals that are fitting to the task should serve, however, as stimulus and guide to the initiative which local school personnel must show in adjusting *their* program to *their* children.

Suggestive objectives which meet the criterion of relative uniqueness for the education of gifted children are:

1. *Education for the life span.* Because the higher degrees of potential for learning typically lead to higher levels of schooling, that is beyond college and into postgraduate or professional study, and because the expanding range of man's knowledge tends to render obsolescent certain of the information and understanding gained by the individual in the childhood years, education can and should be planned as integral to the entire life career of the gifted individual. This objective, when considered realistically, is at once more practicable and more necessary with this unusual group than with the generality of persons.

2. *Education for reconstruction.* Certain kinds of experience point to and prepare for the creative reworking of things as they now are, distinct from simply working within the bounds of objects and ideas already realized. Such experiences must be developed and formulated for the curriculum and only these kinds of experiences truly comprise "enrichment" for the gifted group.

3. *Education for universal perspectives.* Leading statesmen and scientists in every generation play a larger role in the affairs of men, affect larger numbers of people through their behavior, than do persons engaging in lesser levels of responsibility. Particular kinds of school experience therefore must be arranged to develop tolerance and positive understandings and skills which conduce toward interpersonal and inter-cultural coexistence.

Two widely used concepts appear sufficient to suggest the character of subject matter appropriate for the superior mentality in question. Extensification and intensification, sometimes referred to in educational jargon as "horizontal" enrichment and "vertical," are these concepts. The meanings involved are easy. Materializing, these into text and assignment is more difficult. Extensification is any segment of knowledge not normally required or provided for children in general, but which is subject to formulation for school purposes and thus potential subject matter with which the curriculum can be extended for the gifted. Intensification, as a means toward accomplishing the elevated plane of experience, leads into studies that are too complicated, too abstract, or too far removed from the ordinary state of affairs to render them available to and proper for any but youngsters upwardly deviant in capacity and functional potential.

As to instructional methodology neither time, nor this occasion allow detail. Suffice it to say that teachers professionally trained and experienced in arranging developmental activities for youngsters in general have yet a further task in learning the nature of the transposed planes of thought and action which characterize the intellecually superior individual. They also need to discover the nature of activities which provide specific nurture for the development of these delicate and yet powerful potentials in the spectrum of human abilities.

A brief set of specific inquiries will conclude this effort to suggest practical, yet theoretically sound, avenues toward effective curricular differentiation. Ask these questions about any proposal, whether for small scale activities like daily assignments or for larger scale provisions like honors courses or independent study: (1) Does this *have* to be done for the intellectually superior student or can he accomplish it independently? (2) Can *only* superior students accomplish this, either by virtue of the nature of the content itself or of the treatment which the content is to be given? (3) Does this involve and pace appropriately the pupil's present level of advancement in complex mental processes (such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, inference and judgment)? (4) Does this relate to the anticipated social role of reconstruction, creation, and discovery, i.e., *advancement* of the culture as distinct from simple *participation* in established cultural processes? And (5) Is this forward looking? Does it relate to enduring values still pertinent to the affairs of a compacted universe in the space age, or to contemporary understandings that point toward the future in the kind of world that is emerging; or does it merely represent yesterday's values and outmoded understandings about man in his natural environment?

By way of a parting thought, one to take home and to sustain our continuing efforts in this difficult task, let us consider the social significance of successful endeavors to improve upon the nurture of great human abilities. Compare the much more widely accepted special work with retarded children. This is a good thing, a splendid manifestation of democratic concern for the individual and of Christian compassion for the unfortunate. Let us not lessen this concern because now we sense the need to further with similarly particularized efforts the needs of youngsters who are fortunately endowed by nature. On grounds of social gain, of returns upon the investment in material resource and personal labor, special education for handicapped children may be roughly considered to yield equal returns. The cost of the more elaborate educational procedures will repay itself in terms of these children's added self-sufficiency. A striking contrast is promised in the social returns upon investment in the more sufficient education of gifted youth. We have only to appraise the worth of discoveries in medicine and enegineering, of leadership in industrial production, and of statesmanship that promotes peace rather than war. Is it too much to think of these returns as in the order of a thousand-to-one, or still more, upon the larger costs of proper schooling We think not. This is what Hollingworth conceived as the "social significance of deviates;" and this is the challenge and the high ideal that motivates this conference and the efforts of educators across the land to recover our previous deficit and debt to able and talented youth.

PROGRAMS

A NATIONAL LOOK AT PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY TALENTED

by
J Ned Bryan

Individuals differ in many ways. Some are tall, some short; some are basso profundos, some coloratura sopranos; some learn slowly, some rapidly; some lead, other follow. Programs designed to provide effective educational environments for individuals, especially those which are intended for the academically talented, must take pertinent differences into account.

In designing educational programs to provide for individual differences equal treatment must not be confused with identical treatment. Extreme egalitarianism in American public opinion would provide the same educational experiences for all children and youth. It must be recognized however, that even a well conceived and well executed identical treatment of individuals with differing capacities and needs establishes inequalities rather than equalites. An excellent diet for sedentary employment may be quite inappropriate for a professional athlete or a diabetic. Meat and potatoes build muscle for one individual, adipose tissue for another. It is only when information about educational needs of specific individuals is fully understood and when programs provide educational diets specifically designed to meet those needs that democratic equality is achieved.

Speakers here will bring you accounts of efforts in behalf of the academically talented student at local, state and national levels. Superintendent Stimbert will speak on the role of the community and of the superintendent in developing programs for the academically talented; Vernon Johnson will describe programs in Tennessee; and I will talk about the national effort. In each instance, however, there is little question that programs will stand or fall upon the effectiveness of the academically talented student's interaction with his teachers, his parents, his peers, and his community.

National concerns for the academically talented student have increased in intensity and scope during the past five years. Efforts such as that of the Cleveland Major Works Program are of long standing, and selected schools across our nation may be noted as having admirable histories of superior programs. Technological and idealogical conflicts within the last half decade, however, have reawakened the public to the need for conserving talent, and particularly academic talent, as a national resource.

Today we are faced with the dual and inextricably interwoven concerns for the welfare of the talented individual and for the welfare of his society. It is becoming increasingly clear that inadequate educational provisions, a lack of high achieving adult models in certain subgroups of our society, impoverished cultural environments, and value systems which place little importance upon academic achievement or talented behavior can and do result in the loss of many potential scientists, statesmen, authors, and artists. At best undeveloped or misdirected ability of a high order represents serious personal and societal losses; at worst it spells disaster.

New and renewed efforts to improve the identification and nurture of talent have resulted in numerous regional and national programs. In addition to action such as that undertaken by the Portland schools and research such as that engaged in by members of the Talented Youth Project of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, the National Education Association initiated a project on the academically talented in 1957. Also the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools started the Superior and Talented Student Project in 1958, and the U.S. Office of Education undertook a Talent Development Project in 1961. Less specific but certainly germane developments have been the growth of the Advanced Placement Program, the National Defense Education Act, the National Science Foundation and curricula improvement efforts such as those of the Physical Science Study Committee, the Chemical Bond Approach, the School Mathematics Study Group, and the growth of language laboratories.

In February of 1958, two hundred educators and laymen met for two and a half days under the chairmanship of James B. Conant to examine ways of finding and educating the academically talented pupil. This conference was the high point of the first year's activities of the National Education Association's Academically Talented Pupil Project. Recommendations were made by this conference for working with the academically talented in English, mathematics, modern languages, science, and social studies. It was recommended that "four years of English, with emphasis on reading and writing, should be made mandatory for all academically talented pupils." The conference held that "it is highly desirable that all academically talented youth pursue the study of mathematics for at least three years. Pupils with special talents in science and mathematics should continue for a fourth, or even the equivalent of a fifth year, at the high school level." Also, "in general, a four-year sequence of study in grades nine to twelve, or its equivalent in achievement, in one modern foreign language is the least to be expected of the talented."

Further, "minimum requirements for students talented in science should be, in addition to ninth-grade general science, one good course in biology and one in the physical sciences." And finally, "at least three years of advanced work, including a year of American history, a second year of history other than American, and a third year of work in the other social studies is recommended."

Subsequent conferences and publications of the NEA Academically Talented Student Project have had significant impacts upon the national effort in talent development. In addition to monographs relating the various subject matter fields to the academically talented, booklets have been devoted to such topics as research, guidance, and administration in the area. These publications have reached nearly half a million people. Further, under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Bish the project is now engaged in conducting workshops on the gifted in the major cities of the United States.

A program of a different nature, but also of national significance, was initiated by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in the late spring of 1958. The NCA Project on the Guidance and Motivation of Superior and Talented Students was conceived, not to bring together top level personnel to consider theoretical and practical aspects of the problem, as was true for the NEA project, but as a design for developing programs of action at the local school level. Under the aegis of the NCA's Commission on Research and Service, with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and with a full time professional staff, the STS Project selected one hundred secondary schools in the nineteen states served by the NCA to examine the proposition that such schools can on their own develop effective programs for their talented students.

During the summer of 1958 STS Workshops were held at the Universities of Michigan, Northwestern, Oklahoma, Minnesota, and Colorado. An administrator and a counselor or counselor-teacher represented each of the project schools at one of the workshops. During the workshop each school team met and worked with outstanding national leaders in talent development, consulted with their NCA colleagues, and prepared a written proposal for initiating or improving a program for identifying and nurturing talent in their school. The proposal for action was based upon firm information about one school in terms of its student body, its resources (both human and physical), its location within a culture, its goals and expectations, and its relation to the total educational endeavor of our nation. As the schools varied from less than 200 to almost 7,000 in size, from rural to urban in location, and from relatively high to relatively low socio-economic strata, so did the proposals for action. Aside from some common data collected in all schools for research purposes the common bond was solely one of a commitment to provide with available local resources the best possible educational environment for able youth.

Two years later (following additional workshops; staff visits to schools; publications for students, for counsellors, for administrators, and for parents; regional conferences; and revised local programs) the NCA STS Project was enlarged. In 1960 representatives of accrediting associations other than the NCA were invited to join with the NCA and the combined effort in behalf of talented youth because of the Inter-regional STS Project. Today eight schools in Memphis are affiliated with this project.

In addition to the benefits accruing to member schools the STS Project has provided some generalizable practices and emerging principles. These along with descriptions of roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups as they relate to STS programs will be stated in a forthcoming publication. They include such observations as "effective procedures for identifying STS are based upon multiple and interdisciplinary criteria" and "effective criteria for identifying STS define expected overt behavior." Under guidance it has been observed that "effective guidance provisions for STS are planned as a part of and consciously considered within the total guidance program" and "effective guidance provisions for STS help the student meet individual emotional needs as well as complex, diverse educational needs. Effective motivation toward high achievement," it has been noted, "takes place in an educational environment which utilizes the adolescent peer-group structure in developing provisions for STS" and "effective administrative and curricular provisions for STS are made in terms of specific educational goals and must be considered means to an end and not an end in themselves."

The Inter-regional STS Project no longer has a full time professional staff but committees within each of the several regional accrediting agencies are providing firm and continuing leadership. As a pattern for local action strengthened through unified commitment the project promises to pay continued dividends.

A growing national concern for the conservation and effective use of talent can also be seen in the action taken by the U.S. Office of Education in its recent appointment of a specialist for the education of gifted and talented children and youth. A Talent Development Project has been initiated and the specialist has been named chairman of the project's Professional Committee.

The U.S. Office of Education Talent Development Project (not to be confused with the University of Pittsburgh Project Talent) promises to provide a national forum, a clearinghouse, and support for efforts to develop talent at all levels. Academic, creative, kinesthetic, and psychosocial talent of a reasonably high order will be considered from kindergarten through the graduate school. As a national effort this project can serve at least three major functions: that of eliciting and disseminating information about research and practice in talent development, that of encouraging and supporting pure and applied research in talent development, and that of implementing effective practices in talent development.

The Talent Development Project represents a new emphasis rather than a new concern of the U.S. Office of Education. Publications, research, and efforts of Office specialists have consistently given attention to this area of education.

Illustrative of OE publications in the area of talent development are the following:

Jewett, Amo, *et al. Teaching Rapid and Slow Learners in High School.* OE Bulletin Number 5, 1954.

Greer, Edith *The Education of the Able Student.* OE Circular Number 532, 1958.

Lewis, Gertrude M. *Educating the More Able Children in Grades Four, Five, and Six.* OE 35006, 1961.

Miller, Leonard *Guidance for the Underachiever with Superior Ability.* OE 25021, 1961.

Hatch, Winslow R., and Bennett, Ann *Independent Study.* (New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 1). OE 50005, 1960.

Publications by specialists in the Office are frequently based upon research findings. Research, however, has not been limited to the Office staff in that some sixty-six research contracts have been concerned with various elements of talent development. Almost $300,000 was spent by the Cooperative Research Branch of the Office for research contracts in this area during the 1962 fiscal year and about $620,000 is budgeted for this purpose in fiscal year 1963.

The Talent Development Project can provide tested alternative courses of action in the identification and nurture of talent. In addition to publications and research, consultant services and conferences can play a significant role in the national effort to inform, encourage, and aid personnel in schools and colleges to provide more effectively for talented children and youth. As an Office of Education endeavor the Talent Development Project is in a strategic position to help our nation initiate and/or improve programs for the academically talented. It is sincerely hoped that this promise will be fulfilled.

Three national programs have been described to illustrate the current climate in which programs for the academically talented are being developed. These were chosen because I have been personally involved in each of these and I thus feel comfortable in discussing them. Each of the three programs, however, has made and is making a significant contribution in our nation. I believe they serve well as examples to which we can turn in our search for evidence of the nation's action in this area of concern.

As individuals you may be more concerned with curricula, or faculty, or physical facilities, or levels of aspiration. These are each significant in their own way and we might have chosen to discuss them. Since we did not do so you may wish to explore these and other facets on your own. In this conference we can but at best open doors. You must take the next steps. Turn to your nation's leaders of course, but remember that the academically talented children and youth are in your classrooms and it is here that action must take place.

Yes, individuals differ in many ways and we must ever be mindful of those who need our help. We must not make the easy and false assumption that those who are talented are also self-sufficient.

For the welfare of the academically talented and for our survival, we must resolve to use all available resources—local, state, and national—in our efforts to provide truly effective educational environments in which they can find the nutriment and the challenge to fulfill their promise.

SOME PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY TALENTED IN TENNESSEE

by

Vernon L. Johnson

Dr. Ray Graham, the late Director of Special Education in Illinois, in one of his last published articles referred to a story told by Lincoln Steffens in his autobiography. This story involves a man and the Devil walking together down the street of a busy city. They saw a man reach out and grasp a fine and worthy idea—right out of the air. The man said to the Devil, "Did you see that? And aren't you afraid of it? A worthy idea can grow and grow until it becomes powerful it will destroy you." The Devil replied, "No, I am not afraid of it. First they will give it a name. Then they will organize and promote it, and then there will be so many ideas of how to handle it that they will become confused and disagree among themselves and the worthy idea will weaken and die itself. No, I am not afraid of it."

Time will not permit a review of the many fine ideas in the development of education that have grown and endured in spite of the Devil. These ideas have had to overcome the obstacles set up by the Devil's advocates: (1) misconception as to purpose and plan, (2) conformity to past patterns and established beliefs, and (3) lethargy of action. All of us are aware of a number of ideas that have been unable to survive and of others that are in the midst of the struggle. Special provisions for the academically talented could well be one of the latter.

The Tennessee State Department of Education has long been committed to a role that urges and assists local school systems in developing and evaluating instructional programs which provide for individual differences. Every new statement of beliefs and listing of needs reiterates this position. Too often, however, it is glibly stated and promptly ignored in the involved process of providing educational opportunities for all. The greatest good for the greatest number has had priority. In meeting its responsibilties to provide those educational opportunities which will allow each individual to develop to the maximum of his potential, the State Department of Education has employed a variety of techniques and approaches, but usually by supporting promising practices rather than by initiating new procedures.

It would appear that the State Department has assumed a more prominent role in the development of programs for the gifted. As early as 1952, with the development of the State Curriculum Committee, an effort was made to give more than lip-service to the concept of providing for individual differences. Since 1955 it has been possible to establish experimental programs for children with exceptional ability. When this permissive attitude did not evoke the desired action from local school systems, two additional efforts have been made almost simultaneously: (1) participation in the development of a policy statement by the Study Commission of the Council of Chief State School Officers (1959-61), and (2) participation in the Southern Regional Project for Education of the Gifted (1960-61).

An added impetus to the movement is expected when the published reports of these activities are released for use during the school year 1962-63.

This is not to imply that local school systems have ignored the problem. Good teachers have always made some provisions for individual differences, but a number of factors has made it increasingly difficult to achieve the desired results.

A review of the practices currently being used shows that very few of the local school systems have system-wide educational programs for the academically talented. Instead some fragmentary or piecemeal provisions have been made. Any discussion of program structure will involve the traditional terms of "enrichment," and "grouping." These are not mutually exclusive. In an effort to meet the identified educational needs of the academically talented, individual schools and local school systems are making special provisions through one or a combination of administrative plans for instructional purposes. The three plans most commonly reported are: (1) regular classrooms where provisions are made for individual opportunities for enrichment in breadth and depth; (2) rapid promotion or acceleration of progress through the regular educational program; and (3) some form of grouping according to ability level and/or interests rather than on the basis of chronological age.

Some of the provisions seem to have been made as a result of pressure groups or a desire to get on the band wagon.

What types of programs are in existence? You name it; Tennessee public schools have it, with the possible exception of the special school. Some reported types of organization include: (1) special classes, (2) cluster grouping, (3) seminar type classes, (4) special interest groups, (5) special grouping in curricular areas, (6) advanced placement and honors programs, (7) ungraded primary units, and (8) summer schools. Obviously time will not permit a detailed description of the reported plans. An attempt will be made to summarize and give some specific examples. A detailed report is planned for presentation to the Instruction Committee at the Annual Conference of the Superintendents' Study Council next fall.

First, *enrichment* is the most widely reported practice. Under this plan an attempt is made to provide the child with educational experiences which will permit depth and breadth to the regular curriculum without disrupting the regular class organization.

Grouping, or class placement based upon ability, achievement, or interest, is another common practice. The primary unit plan would fall in this category as well as being considered a plan to provide for acceleration. Developmental reading programs have been reported. The grouping may be used for part of the day or may be a permanent arrangement. Part time seminars as reported by some systems have been very gratifying. Usually these involve the use of resource persons from the community and the seminars do not meet during the regular school day. Educational television, both open and closed circuit, is opening many avenues for use in enrichment and special interest groups. A notable example of grouping is the special class arrangement in the experimental program in Murfreesboro City Schools. This plan, in its third year of operation, involves the moving of the children from their regular classroom one day each week for instruction by a special teacher. The curriculum includes a foreign language, typewriting, critical reading, creative experiences, public speaking, and individual projects. A screening committee selects the children from those identified as having I.Q.'s of 125 or higher. Psychological and guidance services are an integral part of the plan.

Special grouping in curricular areas is more widespread at the secondary level, although a number of systems are reporting some departmentalization in the elementary schools. The multi-track programs, with or without multiple diplomas, are becoming more and more common. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, through its various titles, is having a tremendous impact. Language laboratories, improved science and mathematics programs, and broader testing and guidance services are in evidence throughout the State. Within this practice there are many variations. Usually an I.Q. score is involved, but some classes for college-bound pupils are set up without regard to ability or subject area. An effort is being made to use the new programs that have been developed in mathematics and science.

This report is not meant to be all-inclusive. Suffice it to say that the picture is not as dismal as many critics paint it. Much does remain to be done. Let us use the resources at our command to overcome the obstacles set up by the Devil's advocates. Let us carry out our worth-while idea and not let it be defeated by misconception of purpose, conformity to past patterns, or just plain apathy.

THE SUPERINTENDENT AND THE COMMUNITY IN PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY TALENTED

by

Mr. E. C. Stimbert

This conference will help us as school administrators and as people in a given community to focus attention properly on phases of programs now existing or on the programing that is yet to be. I think this conference will dampen improper enthusiasm and this is good. I think it will stimulate constructive programing. I think it will point the direction for further study for the initiating and continuing of programs. Some need to be started. So let's single out a few thoughts pertinent to a local system.

May we apply what we've been talking about in this conference—two-way communication? In the final analysis this is the way it should happen. As you have heard, even if there are coordinating efforts and stimulation at the national and state level, the actual work must be done by some school people at the local level and eventually by some teachers in some learning situations. We first must find out what is being done, and that's why this kind of conference is so good. This is so much better than a group in a community getting excited about something and coming to school people and attempting to force or pressure a program. It is obvious that this is not the wish of any group here. I noticed that some questions in the group that I attended pointed up that we school people should be doing more in this area. I took this as a criticism only because I think we school people do not have as good a public relations program as we should have. If people don't know, it is our fault and not the fault of the people. But so many groups usually begin on the assumption that nothing is being done. That was not the philosophy of the group coordinating this conference. Theirs has been a positive approach rather than a negative or critical one.

Now for a brief review of some of the things we need to do at the community level. I think there is no question but that we must have more and better trained guidance personnel. This is a very positive recommendation. What bothers me is that we will say this and then turn right around as school people, and sometimes as lay groups, and force a kind of pressure that will deny guidance people and guidance philosophies the right to operate. Well, if we are going to say to guidance people, "This is what everybody must take in science, math, social studies, or what have you, in order to get a diploma," then we might as well fire all the guidance people, because there will be nothing for them to do. What I'm saying is, let's move in the other direction. I'm radical enough and prejudiced enough to want to do away with all requirements for graduation. I believe that if we move in the direction of what I just said, that of knowing more and more about our pupils, then the recommendation of the head of the school about a given pupil in the school would be all that we would need. I know that we have to have transcripts of some of these things. I grant you that. But we wouldn't have to worry whether they had four years of English, or three or two, because may be some of these pupils we are talking about just don't need the four years that are now prescribed. Let's not focus attention on the restrictions, credits, and all these kinds of things set up as administrative minutia so that we forget we have a child to be understood completely.

We need to know more about children. Data processing is one of the ways that we can accumulate a lot of information. Lack of it has been one of our problems. People in agriculture know a lot more about the legislation that they can put through Congress, because they have the ways of accumulating the data, retrieving it, and saying this is what is needed. This should be done at the local and state level in education. We've talked a little bit about sharing data, about the way data can be transmitted, and about the way it can be stored. It means that we can have information about boys and girls, get it immediately, and act accordingly.

The training of teachers by in-service meetings is another facet of the program. No teacher will ever be the same, even though he may be attending ever so unwillingly. Some teachers reach forth with enthusiasm. In-service learning experiences change teachers. No one who has attended this conference will be the same after having heard the thoughts that were expressed here. The training of teachers will be important too. We can't put the whole responsibility on guidance personnel. I'm looking at this again from an administrative point of view. We can talk about all kinds of programs and what we are going to do, but it is impossible for us to do it all in terms of what we believe. It is going to be done by supervisors and by teachers. This means training. We administrators must have an acceptance of our philosophy if the program is to be carried out by someone else. Therefore, it's not what somebody believes at the administrative level but what all believe. The training of teachers needs to be done in the direction this conference has been pointing.

A suggestion made in an advisory group might be included as a technique. In the vocational field this has been carried on successfully. A citizen's group will work with the school people in establishing a certain prescribed course such as industrial chemistry. This gives the businessman an opportunity to know more about the school system and at the same time it gives the school system an opportunity to know what some of the problems are in business. This relationship is good and out of it comes an educational service to boys and girls. Vocational people have been doing this for years. Some of this same procedure is used in establishing programs for retarded children. I see no reason why in the particular area of the academically talented there should not be some advisory group—probably more educative and informative than policy-making or program-making in nature. There is enough for everyone to do and I'm sure if there were such an advisory group that group could be responsible for the dissemination to the public of what is being done in the school system and what ought to be done.

Then there ought to be experimentation and research. We school administrators probably ought to subscribe to this more than we do. I know it is sometimes very difficult to get funds for research, because one can't say exactly what the results are going to be. In fact, if one could there wouldn't be the need to do the experiment. So we have to rely on faith at this point, and this is difficult to sell sometimes. One wants to do this, one doesn't know how it will come out, and it's going to cost money. Not that this would detract from anything that has been said or done, but when we get through talking philosophy, dedicated administrators and teachers at some point are going to have to get some funds for what is to be done. Generally speaking, the programs for the academically talented run about ½ of 1% of the total pupil population. In Memphis that would cost $140,000.00. I grant you there is much that can be done which does not require money. Nevertheless the dollar sign does have to come into the picture at some point. You've heard about the eight schools that are in the Superior and Talented Student Project. I think the significant thing about that is that none—not one of the eight—will be like any other school. When we get parents' reactions to these things, they'll say, "Is the school that my child is planning on attending one of the eight?" Of course, we have to add that there is other experimentation going on for other programs and activities in other schools. And it is combined so they can share experiences. They are tied together as a kind of team. And this broad emphasis—just like a conference—is good. To focus attention on something (to be in this project, you see) is good for eight of our schools.

I close with this one. I think we are going to have to dedicate ourselves really and truly to the general support of education. This is a point that I feel very keenly about because I don't think that America is as dedicated to education today as she was as a nation some years ago. When we do something for the academically talented, the entire school program is lifted. Maybe if we supported general education with dedication we wouldn't have to worry so much then about what we are doing for the gifted. It would be there as a part of the program to which we're dedicated. In this way we show our belief in some of the philosophies that have been expressed during this conference.

PROBLEMS

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF PARENTS OF THE GIFTED

by
Willard Abraham

There are five major problems that I want to raise that have implications for parents of gifted youngsters.

First, underachievement and the drop-out rate. The pattern of achievement or underachievement, I am quite sure, is established very early. Where do youngsters get the idea in general of following through on something, of sticking to a task once they've started it, of exploring, of exchanging ideas? The best teachers that youngsters ever have are all of us in this room if we are parents. These are the teachers youngsters start out with. All you have to do is think of speech patterns of children. How do they happen to use certain words that they use and the way in which they use them? It's not the outside community that gives it to them. It has caused a lot of embarrassment in nursery schools and in kindergartens because children take into nursery schools and kindergartens some of the expressions we don't like them to take in. They carry them from us because they are copying what we say, and this business of underachievement also frequently starts in the home. I don't want to say that the parents are entirely responsible. I won't quite accept that responsibility myself with my own children. It's a very convenient point for me to make right now. I'm not responsible for the underachievement of my youngsters. My wife is, and her family. But the pattern is started early, and the drop-out rate starts early. Should we think of the age of sixteen as the beginning of the drop-out rate? No such thing. The drop-out rate begins very, very early. In the home and in the first grade. Just examine a six-year old youngster who has looked forward eagerly to going to school. His parents have wanted him to go to school, maybe to a fault. Anyway, he has looked forward to going to school. He wants to get there and then he does, and may be greeted, frankly, by a very poor teacher. His drop-out rate, for him as an individual, begins at that point, not later on. Or it can begin even earlier in the home when the parent says, "You can get away with that stuff in the house, but when you get to school you are going to have to toe the mark." The drop-out rate may begin then. It may end when he leaves school at the age of 16, but it is a so-called accumulation of the trivial. We've heard that expression in connection with the divorce rate a lot of times. It isn't that something happens all of a sudden, which may be just the straw that broke the camel's back, it is the accumulation of a lot of things. Earl C. Kelley, an important man in the education field, made the statement, "We talk about drop-outs, but we don't even know how to count them. Most of them are still in school." I think there is something to that. The youngsters who dream in school, and the youngsters who just do not follow through. What do we do about this underachievement, and what are some of the things that can be of a practical value in our homes and in our communities?

In Phoenix, Arizona, we have an organization called "Careers Incorporated." It gives bright youngsters who come from "less-chance" neighborhoods the idea that just because their parents only went to the 4th grade doesn't mean that they should be satisfied only going to 6th or 8th grade. Maybe they can stay on a lot longer. Brightness permeates every part of our society.

Another thing we can do about the drop-out rate, and to help avoid it—you may not go along with this idea, but I'd like to pose it anyway—is explained in the one word, "inspiration." A one-to-one relationship is necessary for some youngsters who are having a hard time somehow adapting to a home and school environment. Inspiration. Just turn the clock back a little bit for yourselves and see if there hasn't been somebody sometime who thought you were pretty terrific. Maybe even now somebody does. But think back then, when you were in adolescence or before. I could personalize this, but I won't. I'm sure each one of us could think of somebody who thought we were imprtant, who wanted to exchange ideas with us, who listened to the darn-fool things that we said, and who thought we were important. It was a one-to-one relationship.

What about the idea of early identification of bright youngsters, the idea of expectation for them at a relatively early age? They're bright and our expectations should run fairly high for them. Take the three words of ability, aspiration, and achievement and try to coordinate these three. A bright youngster might be achieving at a low level. It may be his parents' aspiration level and his community aspiration level are low. Our objective is to bring all of these in line with each other at a higher level. The same thing obviously applies at the other end of the scale with mentally retarded children. Their ability level may be very low, their achievement level may be very low, but the problem may occur because parents have a very high aspiration level for them. Suppose there is a history of medicine in the family. The father is a doctor, the grandfather was a doctor, and they are looking forward to having this firstborn grandchild become a doctor. They're going to have three generations of doctors in the family. Nothing wrong with that. That's fine, except that the third one has an IQ of around 60.

Let me move on to number two in this realm of parental problems. One of the problems that parents of bright youngsters face is the existence of parents of so-called average youngsters who are very concerned about a program that singles out bright children. It is undemocratic, some of them have said. We might as well bring the term right out into the open. A lot of people say that when you do anything special for gifted youngsters, you are doing something undemocratic. It is important to realize that when there are sound educational programs for the gifted, there are going to be sounder educational programs for everybody. This permeates the entire school system. There's more individualizing that takes place, more use of community resources, more material, but there is a reluctance on the part of our society as a whole to recognize these differences. A statement that was made by a lady in the gifted child literature some time ago said, "There is nothing so unequal as equal treatment of unequals." I wholly subscribe to that because equal opportunity does not mean the same opportunity for all of these youngsters.

A third problem of parents of gifted youngsters is in a realm that I have to go into very, very cagily, but I hope you will understand. This is the realm of teachers and school administrators who are sometimes threatened because there are youngsters in their schools who are smarter than they are. This is inevitable. The shoe fits in school, and it fits in the home too—parents also are threatened by the fact that there are some youngsters in their families who are smarter than they are. Fortunately, we have a reasonable amount of maturity on our side, I hope. Too, we have a reasonable amount of knowledge on our side, and insights on the basis of our experience. But I wonder if it isn't necessary that all of us help as much as we possibly can to see that we get into our schools, into our profession of teaching, people who are well qualified to work with these youngsters.

The selection process isn't refined enough. This is the most important job in the world—educating our next generation. If anybody knows one more important, I wish he'd let me know what it is. I don't know anything more important than educating our next generation—to be sure we *have* a next generation even. And how careful are we in selecting these teachers? We are not careful enough. I can document this in the institution where I teach, and I can document it in many other institutions of higher learning around the country. I can document it in connection with the preparation program of teachers. There is a lot of duplication, and not just in professional education courses. There's a lot of it in English, in history, and in science. You can go right through the liberal arts requirements as well as the professional education requirements and you can check off the amount of time that is wasted in preparing our teachers. One of the ways in which we can help in getting better teachers and administrators is with well-planned, in-service training programs and with professional libraries. Most schools around this country do not have an adequate, professional library for the teachers who are in the schools. The same Earl Kelley made the statement that what some teachers try to do is to cover material, and he said that one of the things they should try to do more frequently is to *uncover* material. There's a lot more in connection with the teacher and administrative phases that I could go into.

One of the points that I do want to make is that we are expecting much more of teachers now than we ever expected before; there is more to be covered in science, math, social studies, English, new techniques of teaching English. I was talking to two teachers at lunch today who went all the way to Flagstaff, Arizona to take a modern course in linguistics as it relates to English. These things were never heard of or thought about very much a generation ago.

Have you looked at a globe of the world lately? Can you identify all the countries on the globe now? I'm sure I would pronounce some of their names wrong. Since a year or so ago there have been 17 new nations admitted to the United Nations. How many of these are well known to you? Could you go to a map and put your finger on them immediately, and could you spell them? Do you know where they are? Do you know smething about them? Unfortunately we haven't kept up as parents, as teachers. This is part of the responsibility we have and it's a tough battle we're fighting. So, let's not accuse teachers; let us realize the problems they face, and understand a little bit why they feel threatened by it.

The fourth problem is one of the parents themselves. Sometimes they feel threatened. I know a father, for example, who went to school during the depression years. He always wanted to go into medicine. His family couldn't help him in the dark days of the 1930's, and he just wasn't able to do it. Now he has a son who is just finishing high school, who has always wanted to be a doctor. This father doesn't realize, he honestly doesn't realize, why it is that he is sarcastic and negative to his son, and undermines his ambition. A good psychiatrist, I am sure, would be able to help him understand that he has been very aggressive in his attitude toward the youngster because of his own frustrations a generation or so ago. He has this conflict and he may not even recognize it.

Parents of bright children sometimes know their child is bright and then push them very hard. There is an article by Rachel Carson, "Help Your Child to Wonder," which stresses giving youngsters some time to dream once in a while. I received much encouragement after writing a little article for the magazine *Today's Health* on the theme of "Time to Wonder." Do you ever think about the schedules many of your youngsters face? I live with it in my own home and I'm sure many of you do too. They have school all the way through until three o'clock. Then from three to seven, depending on how much sleep they need, look at each of the things they do. See how much overlapping there is and see how much time they have to partake of something they are only going to have once. I find myself really torn by this because I don't want to think and I don't want people to assume that what we're suggesting is that we let up completely on children and go into a laissez-faire environment where they do anything they please. That's not it, but on the other hand we don't want to go to the other extreme of setting a schedule up for them so completely that they never have any time to dream, to think, or to sit out on the front lawn with the other kids in the neighborhood.

Then the fifth of the problems that parents face is related to the children themselves. I heard a man say not so long ago that some of these youngsters are so bright their minds and mouths are on different circuits. I think maybe this is literally true sometimes. We get shoved off guard. We live with these youngsters who are not always so easy to live with. The placid youngster, the quiet youngster, the one who always does exactly what we want him to do for no reason except "I told you to do it"—this is the youngster who is easy to live with. But the youngsters represented by many of the parents in this room are not the easy youngsters to live with. These are the tough ones to live with and we certainly want to encourage their creativity. One of the best definitions of gifted youngsters I ever heard was by Dr. Paul Witty of Northwestern who defined them as "those who have consistently remarkable performance in any worthwhile line of endeavor." This would be talent. It wouldn't necessarily be just IQ that could be measured. Elizabeth Drews who is at Michigan State University, made the statement "It's unmoral for us to squander a child's time by asking him to learn what he already knows."

I notice that a few of you have paper and pencil. I want to mention a few things which are not strictly in the gifted child field, but they have such strong implications for this field I think that people who are interested should know about them. One is a little pamphlet by a man by the name of J. Lloyd Trump. It is called "Images of the Future." Lloyd Trump is interested mainly in secondary school education. He's interested in revitalizing secondary school education by seeing that we have some courses and classes that are taught on a large-group basis, some on a small-group basis, and some on an individualized basis. Another is a wonderful little book by John Gardner called *Excellence*. This is a great book, I think. Excellence —the lack of respect we have for it and the importance of it in our society. Then, regardless of your politics, look at the book called *Goals for Americans* that came out as a result of a committee set up by former President Eisenhower. Chapter 3 is on the subject of education. The last one, just for fun; it is so controversial and it will be of interest to you. If you are interested at all in education give a hearing to the book called *Summer Hill* by a man by the name of A. S. Neill. Do you know this one? It's enough to rock education loose from its base all over the world, I guess, if people take it too seriously. Read it though, just for the fun of it, and see what you think. And then your speaker tomorrow morning is Dr. J Ned Bryan, who was the head of the Superior & Talented Student project—a three-year study conducted by North Central Association of Schools and Colleges and a hundred selected high schools. There have been a number of publications that have come out of that organization, one of which is a little pamphlet called "Guidelines For Parents of Capable Youth." Copies of this are available if you write to: Superior and Talented Student Project, c/o Science Research Associates, 259 E. Erie Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Now, in conclusion, it seems to me that the old Emerson line that we have to be the opener of doors for those who come after us applies to us as parents and to us as teachers.

WHAT COMMUNITY GROUPS CAN DO TO HELP

by

Walter B. Barbe

One of the main purposes of this conference is to determine what community groups can do. We are to decide if there are things that community groups can do here in Tennessee. There are a lot of questions we must ask ourselves before we even call for community action. First of all, should we do anything may be a question we should ask ourselves. For many years the philosophy has been to let the public school do its job and let the community take care of its job. Now, this philosophy is changing.

The start of this change of philosophy came from the severe critics of education who implied that education was doing everything wrong and we ought to just throw the schools away and start all over. The interest in community groups doing things began originally from the severe critics of education. Then, as a counteraction against the critics, came the groups which wanted to cooperate with the public schools to provide the best possible education for all children.

Citizens' Committees for Better Schools and groups of this type came into discussions of public education with the notion that they were going to be constructive about aiding the public school program. Now, of course this does not mean whitewashing everything the public schools do, nor claiming that everything that happens in the public school is exactly right. We all know that is not true.

There are all kinds of needs in the schools and undoubtedly the schools often yield to those pressures which are the strongest. The schools are a reflection of our society, and if the schools are not what we want them to be it is because we didn't pay enough attention to them. Somehow we didn't get our messages across. If there are things in the public schools that we don't like as community groups, then, we have to take the blame for it if we did not speak up. There is room for both groups to operate, and a sincere need for both groups to work together.

In answer to the question "Should community groups do anything?" I feel very strongly that they should. There must be some kind of philosophy that we agree on because if we do not have a philosophy, there is little chance that community groups will be successful.

Let us talk now about what the community group can do. First of all, we must recognize that this is the kind of thing that nobody can spell out for every community in the country. It is a local problem. The situation in Memphis is different from the situation in Chattanooga, and in Chattanooga it is different from the situation in Kent, Ohio, and that is different from the situation in Cleveland, Ohio.

The program in Cleveland has been in operation for more than thirty-five years. It is the longest continuous program in the country. It was started by the Women's City Club in Cleveland, Ohio. Most people don't know that it's that old, and they don't know the Women's City Club started it. This particular program was started when a group of women decided that something needed to be done for the brighter children in the community. They went to the school board, met with them and told them what they wanted to do. The school board said, "Fine, but we don't have any money." And this particular group said, "Could we support a single class in a particular school?" So the school gave the class and the Women's City Club gave the money for the materials and supplies. The program in Cleveland has grown now, I believe, into sixty-four classes which they call the Major Work Classes for gifted children. And it had its entire beginning from a small group of women wanting to do something.

The goals of the program were very clearly spelled out. The idea was never that they were flaunting the children's superiority. The one thing that they did throughout the program, both to the children and to the parents of the children and to the teachers in the program, was to have it clearly understood that with this mental gift goes a responsibility. Frankly, they used the word "responsibility" a lot more often than they did "gift." They taught all of these people not to display the fact that these children were endowed with high mental ability, but to accept the fact that they had a responsibility to use what they had. And I think that is the key to any of these programs. The responsibility, not the gift itself. The gift is worthless if nothing is done with it.

The first thing that a group in any community must do is develop an interest in doing something for gifted children. It must be more than just an interest in your own particular child. It has to be a belief in the education of all children and specifically the education of children of high ability. It has to be a continuing kind of interest, and I sincerely believe that this kind of conference is one way to build an interest in programs locally. It is the first step. The tragedy though, as so often happens, everyone gets enthusiastic and then calms down. If we are going to have a conference, the conference is valuable only to the extent that from this conference come some concrete suggestions of what the community can do. There are many sources of suggestions as to what can be done. Some of them apply directly to one community, but not to all of them. I think the point is that the conference is fine for building interest, but from this must come specific suggestions that will apply to the community. If we fail, somehow, to do this, then we are missing the biggest responsibility we have in this kind of conference.

Staying with these interests for a minute, I think you must find people who are interested in the education of *all* children, because they are the ones who will be the best workers in being interested in the education of the gifted. There is reason to be very concerned about the element in the population that is vitally interested in the education of the gifted, because they know their child is gifted and they are going to get him a special class one way or another. If it becomes that personal, then this particular individual is not going to be your best worker, because the goal is achieved when his child gets in. The program must be bigger than that. I am asking for something that is virtually impossible, and that is that we separate our feelings from the feelings toward our own children. Essentially, I am saying that this is not a program which will attract people who are interested because of a particular, single case, for once that case is solved they are no longer interested. Nor is it a program for people who are there to fight a battle or to grind an ax. It ought to include people who are interested in education in general, and who see this as a way of getting a better education for all children.

In developing this interest, it is important for the community to decide if there is a need for changes in programs for the gifted. After all, if everything is being done that can be done already then there is no need. One of the best steps you could take in any community would be to find out what is happening to your bright children. It may be that all the bright children are adequately being provided for in existing programs. It is doubtful, but it might be true. From a community group point of view, you could plunge in here and help find out if the community is doing everything possible for the bright students. And one of the ways to find out would be, purely and simply, to have some kind of a survey to find out how many bright children have been identified. High I.Q. children, if you like. You know, you can get some shocking evidence when you get into this. You may find that they all seem to be from one place. You may find that they all seem to come from high socio-economic background. This should not be true. But if you are going to use *just* I.Q. tests results and just group I.Q.'s, that is what you are going to find. And when you find this is true, which I suspect you will, you are going to have to immediately say, "There must be a need for some other kind of testing," which there is. Then it means there must be a need for more individual assessment, not just testing. Actually, somebody must work individually with these children to find out what their potential is, forgetting the numerical scores, but concentrating on a qualitative assessment of the abilities not just testing their abilities. A community group might assist in a survey or raise the finances to do such a survey in order to find out what is happening to our bright children.

From the community group point of view, how can you encourage or support identification of bright students? One way is to promote assessment programs. The time to begin identifying gifted children is no later than the first grade, so that the ranks of the gifted will constantly be increasing instead of decreasing. I have gone through school records and found high schools that are identifying their gifted. Often they think the children have never been identified before. They are proud of their program, but they forget the fact that these children were tested many times earlier.

The tragedy when you compare the high school record with the elementary record is that you have lost a great many of your gifted. They were brighter in the elementary grades but something went wrong in the growing up process. When you look at these cases individually, you usually can find out what went wrong. Somehow, of course, once you label a child as a poor student he becomes that. Someone made the statement one time "What you think of me, I'll think of me and what I think of me will be me." I know it's true. I know that when you develop within children this attitude toward their own potential, then the giftedness keeps developing. When you make them think they are not so capable, then they tend to get lost.

Lewis Terman made a 25 year follow-up study of 1500 gifted children. They turned out wonderfully well, and everybody talks about it just as though these are the characteristics of all of our bright students. Of course, these are not the characteristics of all people who are bright. These are the characteristics of the group of people who were identified, and identification alone made them different merely because they had been identified as gifted. They will never be the same again, and I think part of the reason they were so successful was because they were identified.

Quite often in going around the country I have had people come up to me and say they were a member of the original Terman group. These are people who are adults now, 35 and 40 years old, who still identify with this group. And what they are saying is that somebody gave them something to live up to back when they were in the first and second and third grade, and they never let them down. And, you know, kids have a way of doing this. Call a child a "dummy" one time, and you have one on your hands whether he was or not. Identification early is vitally important. This is the point I want to make, and community groups can assist in this kind of identification. It is necessary for us to let the schools know that we approve of identification procedures. Not just for the gifted. If a child is a slow learner we ought to do everything we can to assess his potential so that his strengths can be developed; not to try to make something out of him that he cannot be. By the same token, we ought to identify the child's gifts so that his strengths can be developed.

This is not just a program for gifted children. It is a program to develop the gifts of all children. Community groups, if they believe in this, can encourage the schools so that this type of thing will go on. There are some people who do not want potential developed because basically they don't believe in the idea of differences in potential. If this is the case, in your own community, you ought to know it. There are some people who really believe that giftedness is only "hard work." We may smile about it, but it is true. As teachers sometimes we say to a class, "Now, if you just work hard you'll get it." This is not true, because there are some children who get it without working hard and there are some who will never get it. Of course effort is important, but it must be realistic effort.

Acceptance of the fact that there is such a thing as a potential limit for children is vitally important. Now, what happens when a child comes along and proves that you are wrong in your determination of his potential? That's all to our credit. If a child can prove you are wrong and do better than you expected, this is wonderful. It means that we did not make such rigid programs that he could not get out of them. In other words, what I am saying is we're identifying and saying, "He's at least *this* good; he may be much better; I don't know."

What can we do besides use just tests? Observation is vitally important. Information needs to be collected together somewhere. There are children who are gifted in church groups and not gifted in school groups. Maybe because of interest, maybe because of family support of the religious program and not support of the public school program, or any number of reasons, there are some children who are actually gifted leaders in one situation but not in another. It means we are going to have to bring together this kind of information instead of somehow treating the church group as removed from the school group. In community programs of all types it is important that we utilize this information. We must not brand a child, but help support the child so that he will develop his gift.

It is important in a community that there be one group or one individual or one organization clearly identified as the focal point of providing for gifted children. This can be outside of the schools. It is important that there be some place to which people can turn. When a child has a physical ailment the parent can always turn to the pediatrician, and does. Or if the child is failing in school the parent can always turn to the teacher. But what of the parent who has the gifted child, or thinks she has some problems here? To whom does she turn? The danger here is that the teacher has 35 other children and here comes a mama whose child is getting along just fine. And the mama says "I feel we have a very big problem." You know what the teacher's reaction is? The very same think mine or yours would be. "Good gracious! I have 34 problems and one child who isn't having a problem, and the mother comes and says he has one." It is a very realistic think for the teacher to feel that she has to take the big problems first. Here's a child who's getting along all right. Let's not spend so much time on him.

This isn't meant as criticism of teachers. It is meant as a realistic appraisal of the fact that mass education doesn't always work at its very best, and this is a case where it doesn't work at its best. For frankly, the child who gets the most attention is the one who is in the most trouble, and gifted children can keep out of trouble most often. Of course, some of them learn the way to get attention is to get into trouble. There should be some place in the community, a professional person, or group, to which parents, teachers or anyone concerned with the gifted could turn.

Such a group, or person, or organization, or what have you, needs to be very concerned about the bright children who are not financially capable of developing their potential. There are some students who get into a position where they need help and they need it then. The money is available. It is just that we are not getting the money together with the right individuals. When there is somebody in the community who knows the situation he can be a channeling source, if nothing else. A place where the student can say "I need financial help." This same group could well serve as a channeling function for providing scholarships for teachers to get training in the area of the gifted. There has been too much talk about teachers doing a better job for the gifted children, without giving them help to do it. I am convinced that there is not a shortage of money for any of these problems. It is just making the needs known. In practically every college there are scholarships that are turned down. Every year they are not used because nobody applied for them, and then there are cases where a child's education is interrupted forever because he didn't know scholarship were available.

The community must utilize all of its own resources—not just financial. We have an old way of thinking that the more money you spend, the better education you have. But we are reaching the point where we must be sure we are getting quality programs and doing a quality job with the money we are spending. If we doubled our educational budgets tomorrow, I am not convinced our education would be any better necessarily. I think we have reached the point now where we must settle on what we need the money for.

Within our communities we have resources that we have not even begun to use. We have people who are vitally interested in teaching and working with children, and we have made limited use of their services. Professional people would willingly volunteer at no charge their services to work with bright children in their specialized areas. Now you can immediately say they have no teacher training—they don't know how to teach. Essentially, teacher training develops within the individual the ability to know how to present material effectively, to organize the material, to take care of discipline problems, and to motivate children. When you are talking about gifted children, and working with them in a specialized area with a teacher who is highly skilled in that particular area, you don't have these problems. You don't have to talk about sequential development of skills over a period of 12 years. The problems are different. You don't have to give them teacher training in order for them to be able to work effectively with children. In addition to people in the community, you have resources in terms of places to go, things to do, and visitations to make.

Now, let us move off of this and just for a few minutes talk about Chattanooga's program. They are doing one of the most interesting projects anywhere in the country. It may be one of the best, and it is certainly one of the most successful. The Junior League in Chattanooga support what they call the Talented Youth Project, which is operated through the University of Chattanooga but works with children from the surrounding area. Some of them come from Alabama, some of them come from Georgia, most of them from Tennessee and the immediate area. This project provides diagnosis or testing, counseling, and services provided by community people who have any kind of ability to work with children. This group brings the children together, finds the space, uses the material to challenge and enrich, and tries to develop the skills of brighter children. It is the kind of program that has had many, many ramifications. It turned out that a great many teachers began sending children to be tested through this program because they felt that group testing had never found out the abilities that these children had.

Many different kinds of programs are offered. Some of them are grouped on I.Q. Some are grouped on interest alone. Some of them are grouped purely and simply on the desire to attend. You can group bright children any number of ways.

In summary, let us re-examine what persons in the community can do. First of all, they need to organize so that their expression of interest in the development of gifted children will not be merely a single voice concerned about any particular child. The group needs to develop specific and positive purposes for existing. The members need to understand their role in relation to the roles of the public schools and other professional groups working with children. They should encourage identification of gifted children. This encouragement might be either through support of the public school's identification program or through a community wide program of identification. Once the children are identified, concern needs to be expressed for the full development of their gifts. Support must be provided for existing programs as well as encouragement in establishment of new programs. Where financial support is needed to assist capable children to continue their education, this community group should seek it out. Only to the extent that we all join forces in working for the full development of all children are we going to benefit from their intellectual potential.

PROBLEMS IN INITIATING AND CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

by

Leonard J. Lucito

As the title states, we want to talk today about the kinds of problems that are associated with initiating and sustaining educational programs for the gifted, and where possible to suggest approaches which might help alleviate these difficulties. While I don't want to go into an elaborate introduction, I would like to cite come data which will indicate how few communities have solved these problems. The U.S. Office of Education reported that only 6 per cent of the top ability students (2 per cent of the student population) were receiving special services during the 1957-58 school year. More recent data would probably show an increase of services but would still be far short of the mark if both quality and quantity are considered. I think this documents the statement made earlier at this conference: "We are doing an awful lot of talking, but are not getting too much action."

Why should this condition of relatively few services for the gifted continue to exist when there is strong lay and professional verbal commitment to providing educational services for these students? A number of major problem areas can be identified.

One major problem area which has thwarted attempts to initiate programs, and has even made programs discontinue after they were started, is the tremendous amount of *disagreement among the experts.* Let's examine some of the causes for these disagreements.

Quite naturally in a relatively new field such as the gifted, many people consider themselves expert, and are considered to be expert by others, without adequate training and experience. To illustrate, one of these "experts" has recently published a pamphlet on the gifted. The text is inaccurate in many places and asks questions for which there are reasonably adequate answers in the literature. Investigation into this individual's background revealed that he had not even read *one* of the standard textbooks in the area of the gifted. He has attended a five-day workshop on the gifted, and consequently considers himself an authority. Obviously this is an extreme example; nevertheless, too often uninformed persons speak with authority concerning the gifted.

Anyone familiar with the literature on the gifted, particularly in the area of curriculum and methods, becomes acutely aware of the sharp disagreements between experts. Conscientious school administrators, teachers, and related personnel who peruse the literature to obtain information for making decisions in a school setting have been confused by these disagreements. This has led to indecision on the part of lay and school people who are responsible for initiating programs. In many localities, study committees have been discussing programs for the gifted for five or more years without initiating any significant action. Many of these committees may continue in the future to study the problem without generating any significant action.

Disagreement among experts also exists on the basic question of "Who are the gifted?" Without a definitive population in mind it is difficult to devise identification procedures and educational treatments or even communicate efficiently and effectively. Not realizing that the gifted are a heterogeneous group has heated up many discussions and restricted action. Eventually we must move toward identifying *subgroups within the gifted* who require different educational treatments. I am not proposing we divide them into highly gifted, moderately gifted, and low gifted. There are other, more important dimensions—e.g., achievers vs. underachievers and high creatives vs. high IQ's. Perhaps one of the organizations devoted to the interests of gifted students might sponsor a manual on terminology and classification as the American Association of Mental Deficiency did for the mentally retarded. Such a project could have a number of benefits. It could facilitate the search for information in the literature on particular subcategories of giftedness. It may help to clarify some of the reasons for seemingly contradictory results in the literature. More importantly, it could aid communication during discussions by clarifying the subclass of gifted students being discussed; in other words, providing a frame of reference within which interested persons might communicate.

Anyone expecting competent, serious professionals in any academic area to completely agree would be dooming that field to a very static existence. I suggest that some confusion can be expected to exist at the scientific level as long as the field is alive and progressing. Anyone who waits until the confusion is cleared up before initiating programs for the gifted will probably have a very long wait.

In spite of the disagreements among the experts, we can gain considerable courage to act from the results of a study completed by the state of California in 1961. Fourteen different approaches to educating the gifted were evaluated, including cluster grouping, special classes, independent study, etc. The results indicate that in all of the dimensions measured, such as academic achievement, social adjustment, etc., the children who are given any of the special services exceeded those without special services. We can reasonably conclude from this data that *any systematic educational program adequately considered by professionals familiar with the gifted elicits better results than no program at all.* Hopefully this should allay the fears of many people who are hesitant to act.

Let's move to another major problem area in this business of starting and sustaining programs. Many educators, psychologists, and lay people believe there is a scarcity of knowledge about the gifted. What is the *status of our knowledge about the gifted?* The bulk of knowledge about the gifted has been generated by psychologists.

Consequently the quantity and quality of research on identification, motivation, and other psychological variables compare favorably with that of any other area of exceptional children. Until recently individuals with the needed sophistication in research skills plus the experiential background and interest in educational procedures for the classroom have not been too readily available. Personnel of this nature are becoming more available and the literature has begun to reflect this new emphasis. Recently, researchers in both psychology and education are addressing themselves with energy to more central problems of education, particularly in the area of thinking (problem solving, reasoning, creativity, and critical thinking). Though our knowledge is incomplete, educational programs for other areas of exceptionality and for the average have been initiated and continue successfully with only comparable amounts of scientific research to draw upon.

There is another major problem area—the *value structure of society and people associated with education.* We tend to act consistent with the values we hold. Even though most educators and psychologists would like to believe that people no longer equate democratic education with identical treatment, there is still a substantial number of lay and professional people who subscribe to identical treatment and justify it with the concept of democracy. Since anything labeled democratic is held in high esteem there is a tendency for these people to avoid differentiating treatment for the gifted. Several speakers at this conference have elaborated this point.

Earlier this morning we heard that the majority of parents insist their youngster is gifted. I have been impressed by the large number of parents who behave just the opposite. These parents find it difficult to acknowledge that their child is gifted even though he is. A typical statement from this type of parent is: "My child is not gifted; he is just a *good, average* student." In most societies a person is *not* supposed to publicize his own virtues; i.e., the society insists upon modesty from its members. This may account for the difficulty a significant number of parents of gifted children experience in acknowledging publicly that their child is gifted. Yet, one of the common successful mechanisms used by other areas of exceptionality and regular education is to organize support from the parents of the students. As long as modesty hinders a significantly large number of parents from admitting their child is gifted, they are not able to identify with any parent group working toward a betterment of educational practices for the gifted. Parents of gifted children are probably the most unorganized of all parent groups.

Furthermore, there is a generalized fear of deviant behavior. Illustrative of this feeling is the coining of such phrases as "egghead," "the brain," and "bookworm" and the negative connotation attached to these terms. The gifted are different, and can be expected to behave differently.

Also with respect to values, one old chestnut is still operating: people have been unwilling to allocate enough money to education in general. Education is an expensive business. Until people are willing to support the necessities for quality educational programs, not only on the verbal level but on the hard cash level, the initiation and continuation of programs for the gifted will suffer.

Talk about money brings up some relevant questions. How much do these programs *cost?* Are the costs so prohibitive that only a few schools can afford them? Additional costs for operating gifted educational programs are not as high as many people believe. A study in 1958 of six programs in the State of Illinois indicates that in no incidence did cost exceed one half of one per cent of the total school budget. Wilson, in his chapter from the 57th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, estimates the costs of ideal programs from two to three per cent of the total budget. He suspects this estimate could be reduced by consolidating programs into large units. Costs also depend on (1) the number of children served, (2) the size of classes, (3) the design of a program, and (4) how much free help is available. The number of children involved in the program will depend to some extent on the definition used. This is obvious when one uses the operational definition of the percentage type. No matter how minimal the cost, if the percentage of students is increased, the costs go up. Too, by decreasing the size of classes, the need for teacher personnel increases and the costs rise. To the extent the program is experimentally oriented costs will increase. This is due to the extra cost for expensive personnel to design and carry out the research. The experimental programs also tend to be more radical in the degree of differences between average and gifted programs. This usually means an increase in relatively unique equipment, supplies, and services. Fairly often costs are substantially reduced by obtaining free help from universities that assist the development of programs for the gifted by supplying trained personnel. At other times members of the community with professional skills can be used to supplement the instructional staff. Foundations such as Berg, Carnegie, and Ford have subsidized a number of programs. Some states, such as California, Illinois, and Ohio, are studying the question of whether it would be wise to assist financially the school districts which initiate and sustain programs.

In light of this information, costs should play a minor role in delaying the initiation of programs, or in causing them to fail.

Again moving to another major problem area, the gifted generally do *not* become *irritating problems which impel people to action.* Nor do the gifted have the emotional appeal of being the underdog as do handicapped groups (e.g., mentally retarded, crippled, or blind). The most frequent types of problems exhibited by the gifted are the lack of motivation to achieve up to his potential and extra amounts of curiosity which may get in the way of routine. More often than not people associated with the gifted do not recognize the problem of underachievement, especially if he is achieving above grade level even though it is below his potential. When emotional and social difficulties appear, they tend to be moderate rather than extreme. Also some teachers are afraid programs for the gifted will siphon off the better students from their classes, and cause them to appear less effective teachers.

One of the most difficult problems in initiating or sustaining a program is *defining and coordinating the roles* of various groups—lay community members including parents, local school personnel, and state and federal offices of education. Most school districts require permission of the parents to place a student in a gifted program. This can thwart the best of educational plans if the parents are not sold on differential treatment for the gifted. Therefore, most local educators operate on the principle that having parents and important lay community members on schools study committees and other similar activities will sell the program the local school people have already developed. This is a very dangerous approach. Once the lay groups invest time and energy to draw conclusions which conflict with the plan the school prefers, a bitter battle can result. Furthermore, once the door is opened to consider the study of programs, there is a tendency for the groups to spread their work into technical areas for which they have few skills, no preparation, and little time to acquire them. Such areas as identification procedures, placement, and curriculum are examples. Thus, the lay members of the community can infringe on the roles of the educators and disrupt program development. Local educators are then forced to make continual attempts to reclaim their appropriate roles in order to function in line with their best judgments. This robs the educator of time which could be better spent on program development. Frank discussions between lay groups, local educators, and representatives of state and federal offices of education are needed to clarify the roles each can play most effectively. Some "guts" to speak straight from the shoulder would be helpful. For example, an overwhelming majority of parents do not have the sophistication in educational matters to decide whether or not their youngster would be better off educationally if placed in a differential program for the gifted. The decision of placing or retaining a student in first, second, or third grade is of the same technical order as placing students in other educational groupings. Parents could better spend their time: (1) supporting parent organizations for raising funds and influencing state and federal legislation, and (2) learning techniques to use at home in aiding their own youngsters toward high achievement.

Additional evidence of the lack of clarity of role definitions can be seen in that few states offer financial assistance or have special certification requirements for the teachers of the gifted such as that accorded to other specialists in education. On the federal level, it was not until the middle of 1961 that the U.S. Office of Education created a specialist post for the area of the gifted.

Availability of trained personnel is always a problem in new and growing fields. But the problem is even more acute for this field because the nature of developing and servicing educational programs for gifted students requires personnel with superior intellect. There is great competition from other fields. Not many persons with the necessary intellect to implement the type of curriculum and methods needed by the gifted to become creative and critical thinkers. can be attracted into the teaching profession. The pay has been relatively low, and the position has had little status in the community. In addition, the working condition of large class size, harassment from vocal critics, etc. are not conducive to recruiting intellectually superior teachers.

An even bigger bottleneck is the *scarcity of course offerings at the colleges and universities* for training not only teachers but also support personnel, such as administrators, supervisors, psychologists, college professors, and research worker. Most institutions of higher education only teach about the gifted as part of various courses, typically through a unit of individual differences. A number of institutions now offer a survey course entirely devoted to the gifted, but few offer complete sequences of courses. This is partly due to the shortage of professors with adequate doctoral training in the area of the gifted or appropriate experiences to compensate for the lack of advance training. Of those qualified, only a handful spend the major portion of their time teaching or researching the gifted area. Consequently, the necessary manpower to do the training is either occupied with other duties or not available.

Another condition which works against obtaining leadership personnel is that scholarships and fellowships are readily available in other areas of special and regular education at the doctoral level, but are relatively scarce for someone interested in training for the gifted. Fortunately a bill has been introduced into the U.S. House of Representatives called "The Exceptional Children's Act of 1962." It would provide funds for training purposes in addition to funds for research and state program development. Hearings are in progress now. If this bill were to become law, it should provide some of the necessary financial support and continuity needed to develop adequate training programs.

Let me end this presentation now and allow you an opportunity to either pursue further discussion of these major problem areas or introduce other problems for discussion.

IMPRESSIONS

IMPRESSIONS OF CONFERENCE

by

James G. Hughes

In this exciting conference which now draws to an end we have been conducting an inventory of excellence—intellectual excellence upon which the hope of the future rests. Our guests speakers and other participants, including this audience and the workshop groups, have approached the problems of the gifted child from many angles and with a variable degree of emphasis. Although the central theme has been the same, the variety of the presentations have been remarkable. To summarize all that has been said is a difficult task. I am certain that you do not wish a mere repetition of what you have heard, but perhaps it will be possible to state the major issues and conclusions in an abbreviated manner. In my opinion, this conference has emphasized the following points:

1. All children have the right to full expression of their characteristics, potentialities, and abilities.

2. The frequency with which high intellect occurs in a population has been defined. Intellectually gifted children have been subdivided into two major groups by some speakers:
   (a) Those whose abilities are at the genius level and from whom the most is to be expected.
   (b) Those with only superior intelligence, but whose contributions can be of much value to the nation and to the world.

3. The degree to which we waste intellectual excellence have been emphasized. Almost every speaker has cited the need to identify and to detect at an early age the truly gifted child and to afford him full opportunity to develop to his maximum potential.

4. Although improvements in psychological testing through continuing research will lead to more precise identification of the gifted, confidence in current testing techniques has been expressed. We may develop better tests, but those already available offer useful approaches for many of our purposes.

5. The point has been made that intellectually superior children are not necessarily wizened, bookwormish, introvertish characters bordering on the beatnik type, but ones who excel in many things, are vigorous participants in life, and have high qualities of leadership.

6. Great respect has been shown by several of our speakers for the individuality of the intellectually gifted child. There has been general emphasis on the necessity to recognize the child for what he is and what he seeks rather than to consider him merely a part of a stereotyped group called "the academically talented."

7. Proper stress has been laid on the role that motivation plays in intellectual achievement. It does little good to be brilliant but baf-

fied. Therefore the need to meet the emotional needs of the child in order that his intellect may function at peak capacity has been emphasized.

8. That we should afford teachers of the gifted child better training to help them bring out the best in the child has been discussed fully. Although the brilliance of the gifted child may catapult him through barriers of ignorance without assistance, best results are achieved when his interests and capacities are carefully considered and he is motivated to excel.

9. The need for improved curricula for the gifted child has been stressed. Special programs and assignments commensurate with his interests and abilities need to be developed to a much greater extent. These will cost money. But, since we value excellence, we will find the money.

10. Problems of the parents of intellectually gifted children were considered in detail. Recognition was made of the important role they play in establishing a sound home environment that permits the child to progress intellectually without the handicap of emotional distortion.

11. Obscured somewhat by emphasis on the gifted child was acknowledgement of the fact that too many average Americans are becoming intellectual dullards addicted to television, trivial reading, and the filling of free hours with little more than shallow entertainment. The fact that education is a continuing process and that school is only its beginning was noted. How can we expect our children to scale the heights of intellectual achievement when we ourselves graze like cattle on the plains of mediocrity?

These have been the major facets of this conference. What should we do about all of this? I have no sanguine hope that the conclusions and recommendations of this conference will revolutionize the situation for this area, but I do believe that we should approve the following principles:

1. Increased efforts should be made to identify and categorize the intellectually gifted child.

2. Special programs should be evolved and expanded to afford opportunities for all gifted children, regardless of social, economic, and cultural circumstances, and obviously without regard to race.

3. Such programs should be of a comprehensive nature, including better preparation, selection, and training of teachers; curricula that stimulate and motivate the intellectually superior child; and utilization of every technical and educational facility necessary to meet excellence with excellence.

4. Improvements in educational opportunities for gifted children should not be viewed as discriminating against children of lesser intellect, but on the contrary as elevating the entire level of train-

ing in order that all children may profit from those experiences appropriate for each of them.

5. Such programs for the gifted should recognize that the mind does not sit in solitary splendor but is a part of the human body and therefore is affected by the emotions and by physical health. Hence, all aspects of the gifted child should be considered in these programs, not intellect alone.

6. In order to attain the above objectives I propose that consideration be given to the development of a commission, with representation from the fields of education, state government, parents, teachers, physicians, and all other interested groups. I believe they would contribute ideas and energy to study the problems of gifted children in Tennessee, to make recommendations for improvements in their education, and to work together to afford for every child the best of educational opportunities.